

There is no basis of accommodation upon which we can stand. There can be no understanding or cooperation between the two groups. We are engaged in an irreconcilable conflict with this group. There can be no compromise. The difference between them is this: They believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat. They believe that the capitalistic governments of our country, and every other country in the world, should be destroyed, and that we can substitute here in America a dictatorship such as has been established in the Russian Empire. We are against that. We are against it!

We believe in freedom and liberty for the individual. We believe the state is for the people. We do not believe the people are for the state. So we are devoted to our America, to the Constitution of the forefathers, to the Declaration of Independence, to our institutions, and to our form of government. We know that all is not well, that there are some things that are wrong and there are some burdens that bear heavily upon the masses of the people, but we know that within our hands, as sovereign citizens, we hold the instrumentality through which we can cure these wrongs, and they will be corrected when the public conscience is sufficiently aroused.

There is the difference in the positions of the two groups. We are Americans in the full sense of the word, and may I assure this honorable body, with all the power and sincerity I possess, that you will find the American Federation of Labor with its 5,000,000 members and with an average of five associated with each one (which makes more than 20,000,000), always devoted and loyal to our country, working out our problems in accordance with American traditions and American ideals. And come what may, we will stand as the defenders of our American institutions, our Government, and our flag.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 1, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, March 31, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, let us not wait until some fair to-morrow to bring us the gifts of our hearts, but let us lay hold of happiness and contentment to-day and have them for all whom we meet. Breathe upon our entire citizenship an earnest purpose to do good to all peoples. Grant that our country may live in such blessings of Christian liberty that they may be led the same way. Take away all false pride and vainglory, and make us a nation that ever extends help and comfort to the unfortunate. Be with us and let us know the secret by which we may have from the Divine, strength, patience, and forbearance, and know uncomplaining peace in the midst of the cares and problems of life. O bless us with that refuge of sacred thoughts that is in the bosom of our Heavenly Father. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1930, was read and approved.

GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENARY

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a very brief resolution from the Legislature of South Carolina authorizing the governor of the State to appoint a commission to cooperate with the National George Washington Bicentennial Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following concurrent resolution:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, JANUARY 14, 1930, THE SENATE CONCURRING

A concurrent resolution authorizing the governor to appoint a committee to represent South Carolina at the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington

Whereas the joint resolution of Congress approved December 3, 1924, created the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington; and

Whereas by concurrent resolution the Congress of the United States earnestly and respectfully invites all the States to participate in this celebration, to the end that the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of George Washington may be commemorated in the year 1932 in such a

manner that future generations of American citizens may live according to the example and precepts of his exalted life and character, and thus perpetuate the American Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the governor is hereby authorized and requested to appoint one person from each congressional district to represent South Carolina at the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington to be held in 1932.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to and ordered sent to the senate.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] on a radio hook-up on the educational bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The speech was as follows:

THE CAPPER-ROBSON BILL

For a number of years I have been much interested in the bills introduced in Congress which provide for the establishment of a department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet.

For nine years prior to coming to Congress I was engaged in school work, and that is my qualifying statement for speaking to you on this important question.

On April 15 of last year I spoke on this same subject and over this same station. My talk to-night is merely a supplement to what I said then with a statement as to the status of the measure at this time. Last year I presented the following facts and problems with which we were confronted:

Are we giving an equal opportunity to every boy and girl in the land? Do our educational systems fully equip the coming generations to meet the changing social and economic conditions? In relative educational advantages are not our school systems spotty—that is, in some sections poor, in some fair, in some good, and in others excellent? Can this condition obtain without its bad effects upon our republican form of government; upon our national cohesiveness which was always of such deep concern of the founders of our Republic?

A startling discovery was made when America entered the World War. During the draft we found that one man in every four, when examined, did not know enough English to read a newspaper or write a letter home. One man in every five was physically unfit for any military service whatsoever. A terrible indictment of the mental and physical unfitness of a large proportion of American manhood! About one-fourth of these were native-born whites.

The President now has in his Cabinet Secretaries whose major duties are to advance the interests of agriculture, commerce, and labor, but there is no one to do so for education, the basic element in the advancement of the other three, to say nothing of the deeper spiritual significance of education. The work of education, the foremost interest of our civilization, is shunted away in a bureau in the Department of the Interior, where little attention is paid to it by Congress because of the multiplicity of other details of that large department.

In the past the growth of our schools has been somewhat a matter of chance; that is, there has been little scientific approach to the various problems of education, both with respect to its business administrative phases and the teaching process. We have depended too much upon individual initiative and experimentation without creating a means of evaluating and passing on to all school authorities the splendid ideas which have been and are being developed by individual experimentation. The lack of such a service has been most wasteful and our millions of children and the social order generally have suffered because the progress has been too slow to meet the needs. Certainly it can not be questioned that it is the duty of the National Government to see that her citizens are trained to meet new conditions in our constantly changing social order. This does not mean a Federal standardized school system such as that of France and Germany. It simply means the creation of an adequate fact-finding agency sufficiently equipped with funds to study and make public the best available data for the solution of the educational problems constantly arising. A department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet is the only agency adequate to the task.

Conceding that the administration of our schools is properly a State function, we must bear in mind that there is a duty which the National Government owes not only to the States but to its own perpetuity to see that her citizens are trained to meet the crying need for a deeper understanding of our national institutions and be not only willing but able to serve it to the fullest. "United we stand, divided we fall," expresses a basic principle in society which should find its first application in support of a mutual relationship of our State and National Governments in the matter of education.

I believe the arguments advanced for the establishment of such a department are based on sound sense and good principles.

In 1926 I heard Mr. Hoover, then a potential candidate for President, say to the National Education Association:

"A century of scientific discovery has vastly increased the complexities of our national life. It has given us new and more complicated tools by which we have gained enormously in productivity and in standards of living. It has vastly increased the opportunities for men and women to attain that position to which their abilities and character entitle them. It has necessitated a high degree of specialization, more education and skill. It has greatly reduced the amount of human sweat. It has given the adult a greater leisure which should be devoted to some further education. It has prolonged the period and widened the chance for the schooling of children. And from it all your responsibilities have become infinitely greater and more complex, for you must prepare each oncoming generation for this changing scene."

When I heard him say that I said, "Good, he must be for it."

Then when Mr. Hoover was elected President and he selected Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur as Secretary of the Interior I said, "It won't be long now." But I was mistaken. It is generally known now that Secretary Wilbur is opposed to a department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet. He is also opposed to giving Federal aid and assistance to the States. Those who have read his reasons for opposing the same will not recognize in him the mind of a Washington, a Jefferson, or a Lincoln.

When we attempt to analyze the zealous and unselfish devotion of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others to the welfare of their country, we find that their promotion of education, as not only a State but a national duty, is among the most conspicuous acts of their services.

I now wish to give you a little history of the so-called educational bills, and let the chips fall where they may.

The Sixty-ninth and Seventieth Congresses would have passed the Curtis-Reed bill if certain members on the steering and Rules Committees of the House from Eastern States had not blocked the vote on the measure by stacking the Education Committees of both Houses. It is stated that certain eastern Members and leaders of the Republican steering committee of the House are the ones mainly responsible for blocking the education bill. There are other prominent members of the steering committee who logically ought to be depended upon to overcome the influences of the eastern group. Some of them, we fear, are not "on the job."

The Republican Party held a joint hearing of the House and Senate committees on the Curtis-Reed bill in the Sixty-ninth Congress. It also held a hearing before the House committee on the same bill in the Seventieth Congress, but, despite the fact that both Houses were solidly Republican, no action was taken by either the Sixty-ninth or Seventieth Congresses to bring the bills out of committee. A bipartisan vote in both Houses and both the Sixty-ninth and Seventieth Congresses would have passed the Curtis-Reed bill and a like vote would now pass the Capper-Robson bill in the present Congress if the Members were given an opportunity to vote on it.

Despite the above facts and although the present Congress is Republican, the Hon. DANIEL A. REED now refuses to call a hearing on his own bill and the Capper-Robson bill. The reason which he offers is that several prominent public-school leaders who appeared in previous hearings can not now appear before his committee in favor of the bill because they are now serving on the commission set up by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur to tell the American people what character of aid, if any, the National Government should give our free public schools.

This is the reason which Mr. REED offers, but it is generally conceded that the real reason is the pressure from certain Republicans on the powerful steering committee and the Rules Committee, above mentioned, and doubtlessly like pressure from Doctor Wilbur.

Doctor Wilbur and the excuse makers for Mr. Hoover's craze for commissions attempt to justify the act on the grounds that it is the duty of the President to determine the "state of the Union" from time to time and report his findings to the Congress. Although it is true that the duty of the President is to determine the "state of the Union" and report the same to Congress, it is not presumed that he shall resort to commissions, the expenses for which shall be met out of private donations for whatever purpose intended. The creation of commissions for whatever act of government is the prerogative of the legislative and not the executive branch of our Federal Government.

The fight must go on with increased vigor and resolution to win no matter what the political fortunes of any man or party may be. Education in its broadest sense is now the very sum and substance of the present social order. So much so that civilization is at every level a race between education and catastrophe.

Every man and woman in favor of these bills should immediately write their Congressman and demand to know whether or not he favors a department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet, as provided in the Capper-Robson bill, and whether or not he is urging the political leaders in Congress opposed to it to let the bill come to a vote in the two Houses.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, April 8, after disposition of matters on the

Speaker's table, I may be privileged to address the House for one hour on the Soviet Government, communism, and religion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after matters on the Speaker's table are disposed of tomorrow I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but so that the membership may have some idea of the order of business, I want to ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] when you propose to send the tariff bill to conference, if at all? I would like to have the leader tell us something about it. To-morrow is Tuesday; the next day is Calendar Wednesday, and the next day is Thursday, and I am wondering when you are going to function.

Mr. TILSON rose. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I thank the membership for their friendly recognition of my return to my post of duty after a brief illness.

Let me say in answer to the gentleman from Texas that I do not think the rule to send the tariff bill to conference will be ready for consideration to-morrow, and on account of the next day being Calendar Wednesday it may be necessary for it to go over until Thursday.

Mr. GARNER. I take it from what the gentleman says that you will undertake to send the bill to conference by a rule rather than to consider it under the general rules of the House?

Mr. TILSON. I think the usual course will be taken on sending it to conference.

Mr. GARNER. If the usual course is taken, it will be to ask that all the amendments of the Senate be disagreed to and to send the bill to conference; that is the usual course.

Mr. TILSON. We shall attend to this when the matter comes up for consideration.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] over the radio the other night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, is that a political speech?

Mr. GARNER. It is a very good political speech.

Mr. SNELL. I heard it, and I did not think that it was. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the radio address which was made on March 28 by my colleague, Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, of Tennessee. The subject of the address was "The First Year of President Hoover—From a Democratic Viewpoint," and was as follows:

THE FIRST YEAR OF PRESIDENT HOOVER—FROM A DEMOCRATIC VIEWPOINT

In a telegram sent by President Hoover on yesterday to the State Republican convention of Maine he said:

"The party has met the issues before the country with constructive measures. * * * The party's record of legislation and administration justifies the continuing confidence of the people."

Inasmuch as Mr. Hoover has been in office for more than one year and a Republican Congress has been in continuous session for nearly one year, it is pertinent to inquire just what has been done under his administration to merit a continuance of the confidence of the people—to ask, What constructive measures have been enacted into law under his leadership?

The record shows that only three measures of what might be termed major and general importance have been enacted into law. They are:

First. The so-called farm relief bill which the farmers did not want, but which they were compelled to accept because Mr. Hoover was opposed to the kind of relief which they urged.

Second. The tax reduction bill which everyone favored, but which would now appear to have been ill-advised if Mr. Hoover is correct in his recent statement and warning.

Third. The reapportionment bill which should have been passed nine years ago.

I submit there is nothing in this record upon which Mr. Hoover can justify the appeal made in his telegram. He and his party are com-

pelled to rely upon a renewal of promises still unfulfilled and the results of which are wholly problematical.

Senator FESS, of Ohio, told you a week or two ago of the accomplishments of the Hoover administration during his first year. In his recital of the great achievements of that period I observe one important omission. He failed to give credit to the President for the discovery of the new planet, some billions of miles farther away than Neptune.

Two accomplishments the President's admirer singles out as especially notable: The establishment of the Farm Board and the disarmament conference now in progress in London. He told you that the board has been working out the problem of stabilization of agriculture in the interest of both the producer and the consumer. So far as one can judge from the newspaper comments on the functioning of this body, all it has done is to dabble in the wheat market without success either as a gambler or as an alleviator of the farmers' woes. Apparently its processes of lending money in excess of the market value of its commodity and its buying up grain at 10 or 15 points above the exchange prices has made some money for the grain speculators, but I have yet to see any expression of satisfaction from the farmers themselves.

Like everybody else interested in the prosperity of the country I hope that the Farm Board may succeed in finding a way—even though it has to resort to price fixing and other expedients from which the Government is supposed to be barred—of getting a higher price for the farmers' products without unduly increasing the cost of our breakfast and dinner tables; but I seriously question if, from the record it has made so far, the Hoover farm relief can be hailed either as a great or a successful experiment. As evidence of this I call your attention to the fact that during the first year of Mr. Hoover we saw the price of wheat and cotton tumble to the lowest point since before the World War, and between January 15 and March 15 this year the Department of Agriculture reported a decline of 8 points in the average price of all farm commodities to the lowest point since before the war, a total drop of 14 points in the first year of President Hoover's administration.

Of the disarmament conference Senator FESS says:

"We are already assured of a splendid spirit prevailing through this conference. Good will is evident on every hand and a general desire to promote the best feeling seems to dominate the assembly."

This conference has been in session for several months. As far as we can judge from the dispatches telling of its progress, there has not been even a definite proposal of disarmament agreement. We read about the French Foreign Minister walking out in high dudgeon; of Italy's refusal to discuss any terms which may not give her naval parity with France; of Japan's insistence on something better than the 3 to 5 ratio she accepted at the Washington conference. And I confess that I have not been able to follow intelligently the mutations of the disputes between the American and British delegations over the parity we insist upon and have only been able to get a vague impression of a project to obtain naval reduction by increasing armaments all around. Like every other friend of peace and governmental economy, I hope the London conference may get somewhere, but I think it is a rather strange construction at this stage of the proceedings to list the conference as an asset in the administration's record.

The President's admirer also mentioned that under the President's direction the United States has indicated its willingness to adhere to the World Court. I think that statement is news to Congress. We know that the President has recommended that we join the World Court on the basis of Mr. Root's modification of the Senate reservations. But unless we have entirely misjudged the indications, there will be a long and bitter contest in the United States Senate, with no certainty as to the result, before this question is settled. Nor will it be possible to blame the delay or defeat of the President's project on the Democrats, for the fight against joining the World Court on the new terms will be led by eminent members of the President's own party.

Perhaps you may remember that in his glowing recital of the success of the Hoover administration during the first year Senator FESS quoted at some length from an editorial in the New York World, which paid a tribute to the large-mindedness of the President. The Senator for a far from mysterious reason did not read enough of the editorial to give a complete picture of the situation as viewed by that newspaper. Let me supply the omission. I quote from the same editorial referred to by Senator FESS:

"On the tariff the President's failure last June to assume the leadership of conservative Republicans and prevent them from attempting a general tariff revision is the direct cause of the protracted struggle in Congress. Whether his failure to lead was due to some scruple about interference with the legislature or whether it was due to lack of conviction, or to political nearsightedness, the fact is that this major sin of omission produced the coalition, deprived him of control of Congress, and is threatening him now with political catastrophe in the election next autumn.

"His treatment of the prohibition question is, we believe, an example of a rational man trying just a little too cleverly to evade what he regards as an irrational issue. The Wickersham Commission is a caricature of Mr. Hoover's genuine faith in scientific inquiry. It is exactly not what it pretends to be. It is not a scientific inquiry. It is in the deepest sense a betrayal of Mr. Hoover's own highest ideals, and

has done much to impugn them. Mr. Hoover's real difficulty in prohibition, the thing which is turning wets and dries alike against him, is that he has not been true to himself. He has played, and is playing, a game, and men of the Hoover breed can not play a game."

This same editorial had this to say of the disarmament conference:

"Its difficulties arise out of Mr. Hoover's uncertainty in the management of politicians. At the moment the fate of the naval conference and with it perhaps the tranquillity of international relations for years to come are trembling in the balance because Mr. Hoover does not quite know how to face and deal with his own party in Congress."

At this time it appears that the crowning achievement of the early period of the Hoover administration will be the President's signing the Grundy tariff bill. It is practically a year since Congress took up the tariff at the President's behest. He had advised in his message, in connection with farm relief, a strictly limited revision of the Fordney-McCumber schedules. The administration leaders in the House of Representatives took this message as a letter of marque and reprisal to formulate and enact a general revision, embracing nearly a thousand changes upward in the tariff rates, giving a total of extortion unparalleled in our handling of this economic element of legislation. The President's own Secretary—retaining his seat as a Representative from Minnesota for the purpose—sat in the conference that framed this bill and devised the rules that prevented any discussion of it. The high-tariff steering committee frequently visited the President during these processes and took their completed product to President Hoover before submitting it to the House of Representatives. No other conclusion could be reached than that the Hawley bill was eminently satisfactory to the President.

This bill went over to the Senate and the Finance Committee of that body—that is, the administration majority of the Committee, for the Democrats were not even permitted to be present during its deliberations—tinkered with it further in the interest of the tariff raiders, and nearly every day the newspapers recorded that Chairman SMOOT and the more eminent of his standpatter colleagues were in consultation with the President. There was never a word from the White House to indicate that the Smoot modification of the Hawley bill did not meet with the President's approval.

The next stage was where the Democrats and the progressive Republicans combined in the interest of the consumer to correct the manifest exorbitancies of the measure. Part of this correction was a change in the flexible tariff provision, which so far has operated almost without exception to further tariff increases at the hands of the President. The coalition modification restored to Congress the authority to make changes on recommendation of the Tariff Commission. This brought the first expression on the subject of the tariff from the White House. President Hoover expostulated against having the authority taken away from him, although it had been granted the Executive in the first place on the specific understanding that it was a temporary measure which was to remain in effect only during the period when the chaotic condition of foreign exchange made it impossible to calculate the differences in production costs here and abroad.

When it looked as if the coalition measure would prevail the country was advised, in what appeared to be an inspired statement—inasmuch as it was published by a personal friend of the President after lunching with him—that the President really favored the lower coalition rates.

Then the chief of the lobbyists took the management of the situation and formed the Grundy bund which outvoted the coalition and restored duties on such commodities as sugar, cement, lumber, and building materials generally, and other articles which had been denied increases when the Senate voted on these individual commodities. This was accomplished by the familiar expedient of logrolling which, as one commentator recently put it, meant "Let me take the victim's watch, and I'll help you lift his cuff buttons." By this process duties were obtained for commodities which a majority of the Senate had pronounced undeserving of such subsidies.

In other words, individual Senators who had voted against increasing the rates on sugar, for example, because they considered that a higher duty meant merely additional profits for a relatively small group, that furnished only a minor fraction of the sugar consumed and involved an assessment of hundreds of millions of dollars on the people at large, were induced to change their votes through a bargain by which something they wished to favor—perhaps because of the influence of some of their own constituents—should also be awarded a special advantage.

Thus, in some instances, certain legislators were persuaded to connive at one extortion by being aided to inflict another.

Now, we are advised that the President is quite prepared to accept the Grundy tariff in the face of the revelation before the lobby investigating committee of the processes by which the favored industries obtained the rates they wanted.

What are we to think of the sincerity and efficiency of the President to which Senator FESS paid such a high tribute in the face of this recital? How could a man be sincerely in favor of the robber rates of the Smoot-Hawley bill and the Grundy bill and also have been in favor of the elimination of these extortions as programmed by the Republican progressives and the Democrats? Is the explanation that the President was prepared to be for anything that expediency dictated, or is it

the fact that on this matter, which has monopolized the legislative activities of the Government for nearly a year, he has no definite opinion whatever?

Senator Fess, in this recital of the President's achievements, also omitted any mention of the President's selection of Mr. Claudius Huston as the national chairman of the Republican organization. Of course, if its President and the Republican Party want this kind of a chairman, it is their affair, but it looks queer to an outsider. It has been disclosed that prior to his advent to the headship of the Republican organization Mr. Huston functioned as the chief of the Muscle Shoals lobby, which, he admits, spent half a million dollars in its efforts to have Congress legislate in accordance with its desires. Moreover, it has been shown that on receipt of \$30,000 that we know about from his client Mr. Huston deposited at least part of the amount with his broker to take care of margins in his stock speculations. Mr. Huston has stated that he has no intention of resigning his political post and the New York Herald-Tribune, staunch Republican organ, states:

"It was learned on high authority that in making this decision in the face of publicity that his activities as president of the Tennessee River Improvement Association has received Mr. Huston had the support of President Hoover and the Republican leaders of the Senate."

The things I have recited are pertinent to a discussion of the first year's achievements of the administration, particularly as you have been called upon to admire the definiteness and efficiency of our engineer President.

At first his supporters suggested that the performance of a single year was not a just basis on which to estimate the capacity of the administration. It might have been better for them had they stuck to this contention, although there was, of course, the obvious unfavorable comparison of the first year of Hoover and the first year of the last Democratic President. In his first year Woodrow Wilson gave us the Federal reserve law, a completed tariff bill, and 13 arbitration treaties for the settlement of international disputes, to name only a few of the positive acts of that first year.

Against these, what is there to show in Mr. Hoover's behalf? His spokesmen can only adduce promises and the initiation of policies the results of which are wholly problematical.

The economic situation is a proper subject for consideration in a discussion of the first year of President Hoover's administration.

No leader of his party has ever gone quite so far as Mr. Hoover in claiming for the policies of that party and its leadership all of the credit for prosperity than did Mr. Hoover during the 1928 presidential campaign. In every speech he made during that campaign he stressed the claim that during the seven and one-half years that had elapsed since the inauguration of President Harding in March, 1921, there had been unbounded prosperity, and that this was attributable almost solely to the principles and the leadership of the Republican Party. If he did not say so in so many words, he at least very strongly implied that if the Republican Party should be continued in power the poorhouse would be banished from the land and the word "poverty" would disappear from our language. I quote from the opening speech of his campaign at Palo Alto, Calif., August 11, 1928:

"The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not yet reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, we shall soon, with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this Nation. * * * That is the primary purpose of the economic policies we advocate."

In his speech at Newark, N. J., on September 17, 1928, Mr. Hoover, referring to unemployment alleged to have existed at the time the Harding-Coolidge administration came into power, not only said that his party had restored those unemployed to work but had done more. He said:

"We produced a fundamental program which made this restored employment secure on foundations of prosperity. * * * This recovery and this stability are no accident. It has not been achieved by luck. Were it not for sound governmental policies and wise leadership, employment conditions in America would be similar to those existing in many parts of the world."

He also declared in the same speech:

"Continuous employment and prosperity of labor depend upon the continuance of these policies."

Mr. Hoover thus, in effect, wrote a guaranty of continued prosperity and full-time employment at high wages for every man and woman who wanted a job if only the people would elect him President. Well, Mr. Hoover was elected; he was given his opportunity to banish the poorhouse from the land and erase the word "poverty" from the dictionary. What has happened?

During the first year of Mr. Hoover's administration we have had an unprecedented number of bank and commercial failures and the greatest industrial depression we have had for many years. The farmers are in the most serious financial condition of their history. The number of unemployed is greater than it has been for over 20 years. Whatever the cause, we have had the greatest stock-market panic since 1907.

As a life-long Democrat, I deny and resent the Republican slander that we have prosperity only under Republican, and panics and hard times only under Democratic administrations. Considering the people

as a whole, they are more prosperous and more contented under Democratic than under Republican policies.

Let me give you one striking fact, by way of comparison:

During 1929, the first year under Mr. Hoover, liabilities of banks failing in the United States lacked but \$8,000,000 of being as great as the liabilities of all the banks failing in the country during the entire eight years of the two administrations of Woodrow Wilson.

Within less than 10 months of Mr. Hoover's inauguration, we saw the most serious unemployment situation the country has known in more than 20 years; with from five to ten million men and women, who must earn their living by daily toll, walking the streets and the highways begging for jobs that were not to be found at any wage.

During the first year under Mr. Hoover, we witnessed an enormous increase in the number of bank and business failures, and to give you another recent figure: Among 70 important railroads, during January, the earnings of 52 showed heavy decreases as compared with the earnings for January, 1929, while 7 others operated at a loss. In some cases the falling off in earnings was more than 90 per cent. This is a pretty good barometer of the business condition of the country.

We have seen building permits in the principal cities of the country tumble from \$169,000,000 in February, 1929, to \$83,000,000 in February of this year, while our foreign trade is dwindling at a serious rate. Just a word in closing about our foreign trade, and Mr. Hoover's responsibility.

In his campaign speeches in 1928 Mr. Hoover stressed the importance of our export trade. He directed particular attention to the fact that our exports had increased \$1,000,000,000 between 1921 and 1928. He pointed out that more than 2,000,000 American families earned their living producing goods for export, and that the \$1,000,000,000 increase to which he had referred had brought a living to a half million additional families and meant higher standards of living and more jobs at more wages.

During January and February our exports declined more than \$167,000,000. This is at the rate of more than \$1,000,000,000 a year, a rate which, if continued, will in one year wipe out all of the increase in America's exports which Mr. Hoover said in 1928 had been so carefully built up at so much effort and with so much care by the Department of Commerce, of which he was the head.

Moreover, during eight months of the present fiscal year, beginning with the 1st day of last July, our exports have decreased more than \$299,000,000 and our imports \$30,000,000. At this rate the favorable trade balance in America's favor will soon vanish, and the 2,000,000 families Mr. Hoover estimated are employed in producing goods for export will soon be, like all too many millions of their countrymen, also walking the streets looking for jobs.

I say these things with reference to the economic depression, the widespread unemployment, the slump in foreign trade, etc., with regret, but they are true. They are facts that must be looked in the face. Moreover, in view of the many pronouncements and promises of President Hoover relating to prosperity and employment, they are fairly entitled to be weighed in any consideration of his administration.

Recent political developments, I contend, show that the Democratic view that the Hoover administration has been a disappointment obtains with the country rather than that he has been in any degree successful. The disorganization indicated by the division of the Republican majority in the Senate, due to an unparalleled exhibition of lack of leadership capacity, is one piece of evidence. Recently we had an election in Calvin Coolidge's district in Massachusetts, which has always been Republican, but which is represented as a result of that election by a Democrat to-day. A vacancy occurred due to the untimely death of Representative James P. Glynn, of Connecticut. The governor has declined to call a special election to fill the vacancy, deferring it to the general election next November. The obvious reason is that the dominant party of that Republican State is afraid to go to the polls at the present time, lest the Massachusetts episode should be repeated and the country be given another object lesson in the dissatisfaction of the people with the administration. This dissatisfaction is due largely to unemployment and the general business situation. I do not, of course, blame the President for the stock-market crash, which is generally described as "the Hoover panic," but I can not forbear to point out that had Governor Smith, of New York, been elected to the Presidency every Republican editor and every Republican newspaper would be pointing to his election as responsible for the depression and as demonstrating the unfitness of Democrats to govern the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—COMPENSATION FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a letter addressed to me by Mr. C. W. Warburton, Director of Extension Work in the Department of Agriculture, and also a brief statement by T. Weed Harvey, administrative officer in charge.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a statement from officers in the Department of Agriculture. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the attention of the majority leader, the

gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], in order to ask him if he can give us any information as to when the veterans' bill is coming up?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know just what date that bill will be taken up, but there is no purpose to delay it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the bill to come up under suspension of the rules, under a special rule from the Committee on Rules, or under the rules of Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. It is a bill that requires consideration, I think, and my present judgment is that it should come up under a rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Connecticut that there are certain rights which the veterans have now which will expire on the 6th of April unless that legislation or legislation which the minority members are sponsoring is passed between now and that date. May we indulge the hope that this measure will be called up between now and the 6th of April and disposed of?

Mr. TILSON. Of course it is evident that it could not become a law by that date. There is not sufficient time.

Mr. RANKIN. We have been on this legislation ever since Christmas. We began hearings on what is called the Rankin bill, H. R. 7825, for which they are attempting to substitute the present bill, on the 22d of January.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will remember that he filed a petition with the Clerk attempting to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill, and of course we had to wait a reasonable time to see whether that was going to be done. It is now apparent that it is not going to be done, so we must take some other course in order to bring the legislation before the House.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Connecticut knows, or ought to know, that the petition on the Clerk's desk has nothing to do with the bill before the House. The report shows that these uncompensated disabled boys are dying at the rate of 72 a day, and we ought not to delay this matter longer. We hope to insert the chief provision of the bill now on the Clerk's desk, H. R. 7825, to extend the presumptive period up to 1930.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SEED LOANS TO FARMERS

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to me from Mr. C. W. Warburton, Director of Extension Work of the Department of Agriculture, and also a statement by Mr. T. Weed Harvey, administrative officer in charge of the office at St. Louis, Mo., where all applications for loans from farmers in storm, flood, and drought areas in the States of Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Oklahoma will be handled.

Unfortunately Missouri was not included in the original list of States, but with the help of my colleagues we succeeded in getting an amendment passed on the floor of the House whereby Missouri was added. We are happy that Missouri farmers will now share in the benefit of these loans, and are also pleased that the central headquarters has been established at St. Louis, Mo.

The matter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION WORK,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1930.

HON. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SHORT: For your information I am inclosing copies of the regulations governing the making of loans for seed and feed in storm, flood, and drought areas for the crop of 1930, these loans to be made under authority in Public Resolution No. 47, funds for the purpose having been included in the first deficiency bill approved March 26, 1930.

An office for the handling of applications for loans from farmers in Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Oklahoma will be opened next Monday in the Old Custom House, St. Louis, Mo., known as the Farmers' Seed Loan Office. Information with reference as to how loans may be obtained will be sent promptly to all county agricultural agents in counties in which there appears to be need for loans, and the necessary application blanks and other forms will be sent to them for distribution. Our St. Louis office will designate county committees to aid us in passing on applications for loans, and we expect to be prepared to make these loans promptly on application. Any inquiries regarding them which come to you may be sent either to the department for forwarding or direct to the Farmers' Seed Loan Office, Old Custom House, St. Louis, Mo.

Yours very truly,

C. W. WARBURTON,
Director of Extension Work.

P. S.—Mr. T. Weed Harvey, of this department, will be in charge of the St. Louis office.

(United States Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Seed Loan Office, Customhouse, St. Louis, Mo.)

HOW CAN I GET A LOAN FOR SEED, FEED, AND FERTILIZER?

In the following paragraphs the principal questions which are likely to be asked by farmers who wish to get a loan from the Department of Agriculture for the purchase of seed, feed, and/or fertilizer are answered briefly. No attempt is made to give full details of the general regulations, which are contained in a circular (C. S. Form No. 1) issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under date of March 14, 1930.

1. What is the authority for these loans? The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make loans to farmers in storm, flood, and/or drought stricken areas in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Oklahoma for the purchase of seed of suitable crops, feed for work stock, and fertilizer where he shall find that special need for such assistance exists, and upon such terms and subject to such regulations as he prescribes, including an agreement by each farmer to use the seed and fertilizer thus obtained by him for crop production. This authority is provided in a joint resolution of Congress approved March 3, 1930.

2. Where can I make application for a loan? The field office for the handling of applications for seed and fertilizer loans from storm and flood stricken areas in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Oklahoma has been established at St. Louis, Mo. Application blanks and other necessary forms have been sent to county committees, county agricultural agents, or other designated representatives and will be distributed by them to banks and other convenient places for the use of applicants.

3. What is the security required? Each individual who obtains a loan for seed, feed, and/or fertilizer in 1930 must give an absolute first lien on crops growing or to be grown by him in 1930 in such form as to entitle it to filing in the county in which he resides.

4. How large a loan can I obtain? The largest amount which can be loaned to an individual is \$600. The amount loaned will be based on the requirements of the applicant for seed, feed for work stock, and fertilizer, and the acreage of crops on which he gives a crop lien or chattel mortgage to secure the payment of the loan made to him. Loans may be made in less amount than that for which application is made. Loans for seed will be based on approximate cost of seed per acre, but not in excess of an average cost of \$3 per acre. Loans for fertilizer will be made only in those counties where its use is deemed necessary by the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, and at rates not in excess of \$5 per acre.

5. What must I do in order to obtain a loan? You must make application on C. S. Form No. 2 furnished by the Department of Agriculture and accompany it with a note (C. S. Form No. 3), chattel mortgage or crop lien (C. S. Form No. 4) and voucher (Form No. 5) on the proper forms, sending all to the Farmers' Seed Loan Office, St. Louis, Mo., for approval by the official of the Department of Agriculture detailed there for the purpose. In Ohio and Illinois, where the law does not permit the taking of a crop mortgage until the crop is planted and growing, the applicant will be required to sign an agreement to deliver such mortgage at the proper time. Special forms (C. S. No. 2-A, C. S. No. 3-A, and C. S. No. 5-A) will be used in these States.

If the applicant for a loan is a tenant, or is farming land under so-called crop contract, or has given a prior mortgage on his 1930 crop, he must secure the waivers of the actual owners of the land, his landlord, and/or all prior mortgage holders in the space provided on the mortgage form for the purpose. If the applicant is the owner of the land and farms it with tenants or share croppers, waivers of such tenants or share croppers must be secured in the space provided on the mortgage form for the purpose. If the applicant leases the land from another and in turn operates it with tenants or share croppers, waivers of both the actual owner of the leased land (unless the rental of said land has been paid) and of said tenants or share croppers must be secured in the space provided on the mortgage form or on separate waiver form. In all cases where waivers are required the person waiving must certify that at the time of signing such waiver he is in actual possession and owner of any rent note, mortgage, land-sales contract, or other paper and must enter into an agreement on the special form (Form No. 7) provided for the purpose, that he will not assign, transfer, hypothecate, or sell such security without first having secured the written consent of the duly authorized representative of the United States.

6. What does the application blank require? The application blank requires a statement of the amount of the loan desired, the number of acres of each crop for which seed (and fertilizer) is to be purchased, the amount desired for feed and the number of animals to be fed, and a legal description of the land on which these crops are to be planted, together with a statement of the acreage of these crops grown by the applicant in 1928 and 1929, and the yields obtained. The applicant must also show the nature and extent of flood losses suffered by him in 1929 and 1930. The application blank also includes an agreement to use the money loaned for the purchase of seed, feed, and fertilizer, and to use the seed and fertilizer for crop production on the land described. It requires a further statement to the effect that the applicant does not have seed, feed, and/or fertilizer, and that he does not have and can not get funds from other sources for the purchase of such seed, feed, and/or fertilizer.

7. What are the penalties for false representation in obtaining this loan? The law provides that any person who shall intentionally make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale, or of assisting in obtaining such loan, advance, or sale, under this resolution, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

8. What is required after the application is completed and signed? After the application is completed it should be signed by the applicant with his usual business signature, together with his mail address. The application need not be sworn to. The community committee certificate should then be filled in and signed by at least two members of the community committee. The application and other papers should then be sent to the county committee, which will fill in and sign the county committee certificate and forward the application to the Farmers' Seed Loan Office at St. Louis, Mo. Full publicity will be given in local newspapers to the names and addresses of members of community and county committees.

9. What is the note? The note is a promissory note (Form No. 3 in Indiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma; C. S. Form No. 3-A in Ohio and Illinois) supplied by the Department of Agriculture in the amount of the application (not to exceed \$600), bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, and maturing October 1, 1930.

10. What is the mortgage? The mortgage is a chattel mortgage on the crops to be grown by the applicant in 1930. Three copies of the form (C. S. Form No. 4) supplied by the department should be filled in, and the original should be signed and sworn to before a notary public, who must affix his seal. The original and one copy should be sent with the application and note to the Farmers' Seed Loan Office, St. Louis, Mo., and one copy should be retained by the applicant. Applicants who have previously mortgaged their 1930 crops on the acreage covered by the mortgage to the United States should accompany the mortgage with waivers (C. S. Form No. 6) signed by other mortgagees to the extent of the Government loan. Notary fee in connection with the oath on the mortgage must be paid by the borrower, but the mortgage will be filed and the filing fee paid by the Department of Agriculture.

11. Can a tenant obtain a loan from this fund? In order for a tenant to obtain a loan from this fund his landlord must sign the waiver which is a part of the mortgage form. In the States of Ohio and Illinois the tenant must obtain signature of his landlord to a waiver on a separate form (Form 6) and submit this signed waiver at the time the application is filed. The landlord must also sign the waiver on the mortgage when the latter is executed by the borrower. The total of all loans to the tenants of one landlord shall not exceed \$2,000. In this connection, also, attention is called to the second paragraph in reply to question 5.

12. What is the voucher? The voucher (Form No. 5 in Indiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma; C. S. Form No. 5-A in Ohio and Illinois) is the record of the transaction on which payment is made by the temporary special disbursing agent detailed to St. Louis for the purpose. This should be filled in down to the space provided for the applicant's signature and should be signed by him.

13. When is the money advanced? The amount of the loan will be paid to the applicant on receipt of the completed documents just specified and approval of the application by the designated representative of the Department of Agriculture at the Farmers' Seed Loan Office, St. Louis, Mo. This payment will be in the form of a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States and signed by the temporary special disbursing agent located at St. Louis for the purpose. Attention is called to the fact that the applicant must agree to use the seed and fertilizer purchased with the funds obtained for crop production, and that misrepresentation is punishable by both fine and imprisonment.

14. What will be the action taken if an application is received in incomplete or incorrect form? If an application is received which is not complete, either as to the application form itself or as to note, mortgage, or voucher, any of these documents which requires correction or completion will be returned promptly with a statement of the action necessary. When again received in proper form the application will be handled promptly, but final action can not be taken till all the necessary papers are complete and correct. Delays will, therefore, be avoided if the applicant and the local committees will go over all the forms carefully before sending them in. As all papers in connection with a single application will be stamped with a serial number on receipt, the same form which is sent back for correction or completion should be returned.

15. If my application is granted for a less amount than that for which I apply, how will that fact be indicated? On approval of your application you will be notified of the amount for which your loan is approved. If this is less than the amount for which you applied, proper credit for the reduction will be shown on your note, mortgage, and voucher.

16. If an application is finally disallowed, what will be done with the papers? If an application for a loan is disallowed for any reason, the note, mortgage, and voucher will be returned to the applicant, together with a letter showing the reason for the action taken. The application itself will be retained as a part of the department's records in the case.

17. When and how is the loan to be repaid? The note is payable on or before October 1, 1930. Interest will be charged at the rate of 5 per cent from the date the loan is approved. Full instructions as to the method of payment will be sent to each borrower before October 1, 1930.

T. WEED HARVEY,
Administrative Officer in Charge.

MARCH 20, 1930.

MEMORIALS FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Memorials I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 194, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 194

Resolved, That on Thursday, May 15, 1930, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials under the provisions of clause 40a of Rule XI. At the conclusion of the recess the Speaker shall call the House to order, and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEMORIAL HIGHWAY CONNECTING MOUNT VERNON WITH ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (S. 3168) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington," by adding thereto two new sections, to be numbered sections 8 and 9.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut calls up the conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3168) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington," by adding thereto two new sections, to be numbered sections 8 and 9, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the amendment of the House, and on page 4 of the Senate bill, line 9, after "conditions," insert "including the matter of revocation"; and on page 5 of the Senate bill, line 5, after "basis," insert "Provided, That any plan of any building which may be constructed shall have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

JOHN Q. TILSON,

C. C. DOWELL,

R. WALTON MOORE,

Managers on the part of the House.

SIMEON D. FESS,

R. B. HOWELL,

KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 3168) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington," by adding thereto two new sections, to be numbered sections 8 and 9, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill adds two new sections (8 and 9) to the act of May 23, 1928, providing for the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. In order to provide adequate traffic connections for the memorial highway with the existing Highway Bridge across the Potomac River at the foot of Fourteenth Street, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by the new section 8 to convert the second pier from the south end of the Highway Bridge into an abutment, to remove the two south spans of the bridge, and to replace the same by a roadway. The expense of this work is to be borne by the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the commission, is also authorized by the new section 9 to enter into an agreement for the erection and leasing of a suitable refreshment building at the entrance to the Mount Vernon estate, title to such building to remain in the United States, and the plans therefor to be approved by the Commission on Fine Arts.

The House amendment struck out all of the new section 9 added by the Senate bill to such act of May 23, 1928, and amended the title of the bill by striking out the reference to the new section 9. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agrees to the same with an amendment restoring section 9 of the Senate bill and adding the provisions that the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the privilege of operating the refreshment building shall include the matter of revocation and that the plan of any building constructed for that purpose shall have the approval of the Commission on Fine Arts. The House recedes from its amendment to the title of the bill.

JOHN Q. TILSON,
C. C. DOWELL,
R. WALTON MOORE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, is this a unanimous report of the conference committee?

Mr. TILSON. It is. I now yield such time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] as he may require to answer any questions in regard to the conference report.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the bill which passed the Senate was considered by the House and amended by one of the sections being stricken out. That section is restored by the conference report with certain amendments. The first section of the bill as to which there is no contest has relation simply to a change in the southern end of the Highway Bridge so as to enable the Bureau of Public Roads to construct the Mount Vernon Boulevard under the bridge.

The second provision, the one which was in some dispute in the House, has reference to authorizing the Bureau of Public Roads to construct or have constructed a resthouse and restaurant at the Mount Vernon entrance of the boulevard. The proposal of the Senate bill was that the Bureau of Public Roads shall have the right to license the construction of such a house at the Mount Vernon entrance or, if unable to make satisfactory arrangement with any licensee, then to construct a house at the expense of the Government. The conference report retains the second section with a provision that if a license is agreed to it shall contain all the conditions and terms necessary to protect the public interest, including the matter of the revocation of the license. Another provision is that any building which is constructed shall have the approval of the Commission on Fine Arts. Those are the only two modifications that are made in the second section as it passed the Senate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In whom is the title of this building vested in this bill if it is given to the licensee?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In the Government. It was acquired since the bill was considered by the House by a donation of 20 acres.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the bill is enacted as proposed, providing that a license shall be given for that purpose by the Government and the building erected by the licensee, the title shall still rest in the Government?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. There is no question about that. The bill simply provides for the license, the Government holding the title.

Mr. CRAMTON. In the bill recently passed by the House and now pending in the Senate to create the George Washington Memorial Parkway it is provided that this highway shall become a part of the parkway and thus be administered by the officer in charge of public parks and grounds. I understand that there is full authority for revocation of this permit by the Government, and hence there could come no difficulty by reason of such transfer of authority.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is correct. Any contract would, of course, be drawn so as to guard that and every other point that needs to be considered.

Mr. CRAMTON. If that authority is transferred from the Public Roads to some other agency of the Government, there would be no complication?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No; assuming that the Bureau of Public Roads would draw such a contract as we contemplate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How would the licensee be selected by the director of the Bureau of Public Roads?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. By the bureau. There is no provision for public bidding. I think 10 years is the maximum limit. What is proposed to be done is that if a dependable licensee can be found the same policy will be followed as is in effect in the parks of Westchester County, N. Y.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With this distinction: That the parks of Westchester County are being paid for by the State of New York and the municipalities within the State and not by the Federal Government.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Of course, but that does not affect my statement. A license in that case relieves the New York government of an expenditure. And in this case a license would relieve the Government of the United States of an expenditure.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The statement of the gentleman as a constitutional lawyer here agrees with the great record he has made for establishing roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. I believe the gentleman from Virginia is entitled to much greater credit than for any constitutional law he is able to teach the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it was at my instance that section 9 was stricken out when this bill was originally brought over from the Senate. I feared if we should grant this privilege for 10 years to some concessionaire, he would erect some unsightly shack. A safeguarding provision has been agreed to in conference requiring it to be supervised by the Fine Arts Commission. Since this building is to be erected on public land, I would rather see the Government erect the proper kind of a building for the benefit of the public who go to Mount Vernon. It is on public land; and if we erect public buildings elsewhere, we could well afford to put up a proper building here at public expense. I hope no private concessionaire will be found who will agree to erect this building and exact from the public in turn the cost of this leased building. In that event, as the bill provides, the Government itself will erect the building and then lease it to the concessionaire and we will be assured then it will be of proper proportions with adequate accommodations. Since the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] has mentioned the policy followed in the public park in Westchester County, N. Y., I wish to cite the policy followed in Detroit at Belle Isle Park, also in the public parks in my home city of Milwaukee and in Fairmount Park in Philadelphia. In these cities the municipalities erect the buildings and then lease the privilege of operating to a concessionaire.

It is my opinion that it would be far better for the Government to erect a proper kind of structure in keeping with the surroundings of historic Mount Vernon and let it out to the concessionaire rather than have the concessionaire erect it in the first place and exact toll from the public in his charges for service and wares to reimburse him for the cost of the building. That would be an outrageous proposition to my way of thinking, and I sincerely hope no private concessionaire will be found to comply with the requirements, so that the Government will proceed, as it should, with a properly constructed rest house and comfort station.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why did not the conference committee consider the advisability of leaving out this concession respecting a public building under competitive bidding?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That was not considered in the conference. The entire matter, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, will be in charge of one of the most careful and competent officials of the Government with whom I am acquainted, Mr. McDonald.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think this conference report will create the same kind of a monstrosity that we found when we passed the bill granting the right to erect the private toll bridge at Great Falls?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Quoting a well-known line, I may say that the gentleman is "still harping on my daughter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by drawing attention to the fact that at 10 o'clock the morning of the 20th of March construction of the Mount Vernon Boulevard was begun in the State of Virginia within sight of Mount Vernon.

And in that connection to insert some brief observations made that morning by Mr. William B. McGroarty, president of the Washington Society of Alexandria.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter is as follows:

Mr. McGroarty had the following to say to the small group of officials and workmen assembled to witness the start of the gigantic project:

"While the present occasion is thoroughly informal in character it really is an event of world-wide interest, one well deserving the tribute of the historian and the orator, for neither of which high distinctions can I qualify, but in a few brief words I may remind you that you are witnessing the opening episode of a 'dream come true.'

"Yonder we can see the white gates of Mount Vernon, guarding the beloved home and the venerated dust of George Washington, and turning our eyes to the north we can all but see the lordly marble shaft and the glistening domes of our great Capital City, a dream which Washington carried in his heart for many years and of which he laid the foundations with a prophetic insight which now we know for inspiration.

"To link the hallowed spot where he sleeps the last sleep with that amazing monument to the versatility of Washington's genius required the creation of a supergrand highway, one compatible with the dignity of our great Nation, to be adorned in strict conformity to its sacred purpose, and one ample in its proportions to accommodate the countless thousands which in years to come will pass over it. And such a highway the Washington-Mount Vernon Boulevard will be.

"We who are privileged here to-day to witness the first movement toward the construction of the great roadway at the threshold of Mount Vernon, who observe the first wave of the magic wand that will call it into being, are witnessing the making of history."

A GROWING EVIL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper reports indicate the probability of a consolidation between the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern Railroad systems, and I want to take this opportunity to lodge a vigorous protest against this being done. As I recall the debates that were had in the House upon the transportation act of 1920, Congress did not contemplate the consolidation of parallel and competing lines but rather the consolidation of such roads as would form continuous systems from tidewater to tidewater. When I say that I am opposed to the merger of these roads, which was first proposed nearly 30 years ago and later forbidden by the decision of the Supreme Court in the famous Northern Securities case, I feel that I am voicing the sentiment of all who live within the territory served by these roads, and I would strongly urge that Congress so amend the transportation act of 1920 as to make it impossible for competing and parallel roads to merge.

We are passing through an economic evolution, which could not have been foretold by the most radical visionary half a century ago. On every hand we have the long tentacles of the octopus reaching out to crush individuality and stifle competition, first in the mercantile field, then in the banking field, and now in the transportation field. Men and women of Congress, I ask you how long can this thing continue? If something is not done, and done very soon, it is only a question of time before our food supplies, our credits, and our transportation will be in the hands of a very small group of powerfully entrenched financial individuals, and the average American will become but a hired man. How long do you suppose that the American people are going to remain contented under such an order? It is one of the immutable laws of physics that for every action there is a reaction, and, ladies and gentlemen of Congress, I say to you that if we do not apply the brakes it is only a question of a few years before the pendulum will swing back and we will have socialism or worse in this country.

I for one am very apprehensive over the present trend of our economic life. I realize that some of the things that are happening are inevitable and that it is beyond the power of Congress to remedy all of the evils with which we are afflicted. But surely it lies within our power to preserve to unborn generations the right to engage in private business, and above all the right to be themselves.

Surely, ladies and gentlemen of Congress, we can not sit idly by and see a transformation take place which is seriously threatening much that is best in the life of America. While I concede that the automobile and hard roads are playing an important

part in this drastic change, much of it can be avoided if we would but face the situation courageously and with determination. Let us act while there is yet time.

FRANCES REBECCA ROBINSON

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] presents a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 195

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Frances Rebecca Robinson, widow of Prince Robinson, late employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such employee.

The resolution was agreed to.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY OF CHARLESTON AND TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF CAROLINA

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (Rept. No. 1023) from the Committee on Rules, to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 27.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules reports House Concurrent Resolution 27 to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted. The resolution provides for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 27, authorizing the appointment of a joint committee of Congress to attend the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Charleston, S. C., and the two hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the founding of Carolina under the lord proprietors, at Charleston on April 10 to 13, 1930.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House this resolution could not be called up until to-morrow. The resolution was reported out of the Rules Committee last week and the chairman simply neglected to drop it in the basket. As there is no opposition to it whatever and time is some element in the consideration of it, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 27

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a committee of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall represent the Congress of the United States at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Charleston and the two hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the Province of Carolina under the lord proprietors, to be held at Charleston, S. C., on April 10 to 13, 1930. The members of such committee shall be paid their actual expenses, one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL FUR TRADE EXHIBITION AND CONGRESS

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 278.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a House joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$30,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1931, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Fur Trade Exhibition and Congress to be held in Leipzig, Germany, in 1930, including the compensation of employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, but not including expenses or salaries of delegates, for preparation, transportation, and demonstration of an appropriate exhibit portraying the development of the fur industry in the United States, the production, conservation, and utilization of fur as a natural resource, transportation, subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence, printing and binding, rent, and other necessary expenses, as authorized by the public resolution approved March 21, 1930. So much of the amount herein appropriated as may

be necessary for these purposes may be transferred by the Secretary of State, with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Department of Agriculture, for direct expenditure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 283.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes herein set forth under the Department of Justice for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, namely:

For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1930, \$425,000.

For mileage and per diems of jurors; for mileage and per diems of witnesses and for per diems in lieu of subsistence; including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1930, \$640,000.

For the support of United States prisoners, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1930, \$1,600,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—I want to call the attention of the House to this particular resolution for reasons which I will disclose.

I think the Congress at this session has passed possibly more special resolution appropriations than ever before. I am not criticizing the passage of any of the resolutions. On the contrary, I agreed to them at the time. They were necessary and urgent, and there were good reasons, as I viewed it, why they should have been passed. I think there is a good reason for the passage of this particular resolution at this time, because it is an emergency, as explained to the committee in full hearings which were conducted last week.

This resolution provides the necessary appropriation for fees of jurors, pay of witnesses, United States marshal expenses, and other expenses connected with the administration of the courts throughout the country.

They are made necessary by the fact of increased business and an increased number of courts.

The Committee on Appropriations has unanimously recommended the immediate passage of this resolution. My reason for making this reservation is this: I hope the departments are not going to get into the habit of delaying their estimates for necessary appropriations so as to force Congress to pass these special resolutions, as we are being called upon to do so often now. I do not see any excuse in the world for the Department of Justice not to have made this estimate in time for the deficiency bill, which became a law only a few days ago. The deficiency bill passed the House on February 21; it passed the Senate, my recollection is, on March 12, and was signed, as I stated, a few days ago by the President.

It was stated to the committee in the hearings that six months were necessary before the Department of Justice could estimate just what was needed to carry them on to the beginning of the next fiscal year and that it took a month after the six months had expired to secure that information. So my contention is that the Department of Justice had the information on February 1, and certainly by February 15, which would have enabled it to send its estimates in time to have been considered in connection with the regular deficiency bill, which, as I have stated, passed February 21. There is no excuse, in my judgment, for this delay, and no excuse was made to the committee, so far as I recall, in its hearings for the failure of the Department of Justice to send these estimates to the Congress in time.

We are now confronted with the proposition that if this resolution is not passed we will interfere with the running of the courts, because, as I understand, they will need this money on or before May 1. So it is necessary to pass this resolution, but I do hope the departments will not get into the habit of delaying these estimates but that they will send them up in time; and I think the Congress ought to demand that they send these estimates so as to be included in the regular bill. It does not

make for efficiency and it does not make for good business to pass resolutions like this, involving either small or great amounts, separately, and thus take up the time of the House. My judgment is that the departments could very readily and properly avoid it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How much of the fund you are asking for is required because of prohibition enforcement?

Mr. BYRNS. I can not tell the gentleman, because that matter was not gone into at the hearing. What the committee was interested in was information as to whether or not this money would be actually necessary to enable the courts to run until July 1, and the department very clearly demonstrated, in my judgment, that many of the courts, at least, would probably have to close down on May 1 if this money is not made available.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Heretofore the gentleman has been able to very accurately separate the items on which the legislation was based.

Mr. BYRNS. There was no effort on the part of the committee to separate the items. What the committee was interested in knowing was whether or not this money was actually necessary for the courts in order to enforce the laws as they exist upon the statute books and to perform their duties, whatever they may be.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How much more of an appropriation is being asked for this year than was appropriated during the previous year?

Mr. BYRNS. I can not now tell the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD. I will state to the gentleman that the increase is about 30 per cent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he is going to prolong the discussion on these resolutions? If he is, I think I shall object, because there is a special order for the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] to address the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I will relieve the gentleman. I am going to object because I want to look into the matter.

Mr. GARNER. Then that will settle it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York object?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object because I want to study it a little bit further.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 274, making an appropriation for participation by the United States in the International Conference for the Codification of International Law to be held at The Hague in 1930.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$25,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1930, for the expenses of participation by the United States, by means of delegates to be appointed by the President, in the International Conference for the Codification of International Law at The Hague in March, 1930, including travel and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), compensation of employees, stenographic and other services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere by contract if deemed necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), rent of offices, purchase of necessary books and documents, printing and binding, official cards, entertainment, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; such sum to be available for expenditures incurred on or after February 26, 1930.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

THE TARIFF

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] for 45 minutes.

Mr. RAGON. A distinguished Member of the majority side in the course of a speech on the tariff last week made several statements to the effect that the minority made no effort to correct or improve the Hawley bill when it was before the House. It would not be fair to the record to leave these statements unchallenged for practically every minority member of the Ways and Means Committee took the floor to protest against the passage of the Hawley bill. Under the steam-roller tactics resorted to by the majority, the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee were driven from the committee room while the bill was being framed, and then by a gag rule process were not permitted to even offer an amendment during the consideration of this important bill.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF IN THE PRESENT BILL

But before going further into the history of the passage of the Hawley bill I think it is well that we take a sounding as to just where we have gone in the way of accomplishing the purpose for which this legislation was inaugurated. I therefore ask that the Clerk read the first four paragraphs of a letter from the National Grange, which letter I shall incorporate in full.

LETTER FROM THE GRANGE

MARCH 26, 1930.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Until recent weeks we had hoped that the tariff bill might be revised in the Senate in such manner as to meet the needs of agriculture. But, in all frankness, it is necessary to say that the rates in the bill which has just been passed by the Senate and sent to conference fall far short of placing agriculture on a basis of equality with industry, as was promised in the last presidential campaign. It is also true that the bill is not in accord with the recommendations contained in the message of President Hoover at the opening of the special session of Congress last April.

It will be recalled that the President advocated only a limited revision of the industrial schedule, remarking that it was not as if we were setting up a new basis of protective duties for industry. There was peculiar force and truth in his comment that this had been done when the Fordney-McCumber bill was enacted. The industrial rates then established, and still in effect, are admittedly the highest tariff rates in our history. That these rates, on the whole, are effective is attested by the fact that less than 5 per cent of the manufactured products consumed in this country are imported.

Under all the circumstances, and particularly in view of the depressed condition of agriculture, it has been astonishing that industry should demand still higher rates in connection with a revision of the tariff undertaken primarily to give agriculture parity with the other groups composing our industrial system.

Keeping in mind the fact that agriculture is at a disadvantage, as compared with industry, under the Fordney-McCumber bill, it must be manifest to any impartial observer that under a plan of revision granting four times as many increases in rates to industry as to agriculture, the disparity which we undertook to correct still remains.

From the broad standpoint of national welfare, it must certainly be said that we have drifted far from the sane and reasonable attitude toward the tariff which was enunciated by President McKinley in his last public utterance. In the memorable address which he delivered at the Pan American exposition at Buffalo, on the day preceding his assassination, he said:

"We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us nor for those with whom we deal. * * * If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?"

The difficulty with our protective system as it affects the farmer is that, while industrial tariffs are usually 100 per cent effective and operate to raise the farmer's costs, the major portion of American agriculture under present conditions can not be brought under the protective system. For generations the growers of our staple crops have been thrown into merciless competition with the cheapest labor in the world, while being compelled by the action of the Government to buy their supplies in a highly protected market. The higher we make the rates on commodities which farmers, in common with the rest of our population, must buy the less chance there is for the economic survival of those branches of our agriculture which can not be brought under the protective system.

We warmly commend the Senate for its action in incorporating the export debenture amendment in the tariff bill. The retention of this feature of the bill will mean more to agriculture than many farm rates it contains, which we know in advance will be partially or wholly ineffective. It can not be too strongly emphasized that it will be economically impossible for agriculture to continue indefinitely to pay the higher costs occasioned by the tariff unless it receives corresponding benefits from the protective system. In supporting the debenture plan the grange does not ask for any gratuity or special favor for

agriculture. We are asking for simple justice and fair play. The principal beneficiaries of the protective system should be willing to approve this plan. As Senator BORAH said in his speech on the debenture proposal on the floor of the Senate last June, "Unless the protective tariff applies and can be made to apply as a system to the Nation as a whole, then it becomes a special privilege, the result of governmental favor, and is intolerable."

From the beginning of the long fight for equality for agriculture, the friends of the farmer, both in and out of Congress, have steadfastly declared that we must make the tariff effective on our surplus crops in order to remedy the ills of agriculture. The debenture amendment contains the only proposal pending before the present Congress which is intended to accomplish this. In recent months the price of wheat, cotton, dairy and poultry products, and other farm commodities has been lower than at any time since the World War. At the same time, farm costs have been maintained at high levels, principally by existing tariff rates on industrial commodities. As a matter of fundamental justice we strongly urge the House to concur in the debenture amendment.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BRECKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. Speaker, this letter was addressed to every Member of the lower House of Congress. This letter was addressed to the Members of the lower House of Congress from the State of Maine; it was also addressed to the Members of the lower House of Congress from the State of Florida, likewise from the State of California and the State of Washington. It is the voice of the greatest farm organization in this country speaking in the composite to the Members of the United States lower House of Congress.

There is not an organization in this country better qualified to judge of the effectiveness of tariff rates to agriculture than the grange and its representatives. Therefore, upon the best authority to be had, we find that the tariff endeavors of Congress for the last 14 months have entirely missed the mark at which they aimed. There would have been no special session of Congress had it not been for the sore need of agriculture. The President made the purpose of the special session very plain. But instead of placing agriculture on a parity with industry, we have simply widened the gulf, to the hurt of agriculture.

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION AFTER WAR

After the war the farmer saw industrialists of the East come to the doors of Congress and ask for legislation to protect them against the invasion of cheaply made foreign goods and he saw them walk from the Halls of Congress with the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, carrying rates which in many instances constituted an embargo. The farmer saw the railroad companies of America go to the Halls of Congress and lay before Congress its program of rehabilitation and requested legislation to secure them in their plans, and he saw the railroad owners walk from the doors of Congress with a piece of legislation incorporating the terms of the Esch-Cummins bill. He saw the labor organizations of the country go to Congress and appeal for laws for the restriction of immigration which would prevent hordes of poverty-stricken laborers from bankrupt Europe coming in and overrunning the prosperous fields of the American wage earner. He saw labor walk away with the most rigid immigration law ever placed upon the statute books of any country.

EFFECT OF POSTWAR LEGISLATION

The farmer heard the appeals of these different classes to the Government, which is supposed to protect all industries alike, and he has witnessed the salutary effect of the Government's legislative response to the appeals of these different classes. However, when he stops to reflect he sees that the Government's aid to the tariff barons under the Fordney-McCumber law increased practically everything which goes into his actual living expenses and the operating expenses of his farm. He reflects also that the railroad legislation, which proves so beneficial to the railroad people, increased the freight rates of the country, which was reflected in the increased prices he has to pay for the necessities of life. He was happy to see the salutary effect of the immigration law on the wage earners of this country. But this very fact, which made the industrial centers of the country so attractive, had a tendency to steal away the surplus farm labor to such an extent that farm labor costs have increased practically 65 per cent. The farmer has been compelled to stand by and watch the Government, by legislation, effect an economic condition in this country which has resulted in two price levels, which as late as this month was a 15 per cent disadvantage to the farmer.

In this month the index number of farm prices for 30 agricultural products was 131, while the index price for commodities which the farmer bought was 154.

You can not solve the farm problem or even aid it with a tariff when you seek to build up agricultural rates and at the same time increase in any amount the present industrial rates. The trouble with the farmer is that he can not make his income meet his overhead expenses, and when he stops to reflect he finds that a goodly percentage of his overhead expenses is imposed upon him by governmental favoritism extended to certain classes.

Some Members who profess to be great lovers of the farmers have in time past referred disparagingly to the Underwood tariff bill. It might be of some interest and information to you to know that from 1913 to 1918 the selling price level of the farmer was practically the equal of his buying price level, the shade of difference being in favor of the selling price.

Any tariff bill which sky rockets industrial rates will increase the farmer's buying price level. This will happen even though you give him rates on agriculture equally high, because the industrial rates, due to the home markets, are effective, and the agricultural rates, due to the large export surplus, are ineffective.

TRUE FARM CONDITIONS

I do not believe there has been any industry in the history of this country which suffered such demoralization as agriculture has since 1920. The value of farm lands and buildings alone decreased from \$66,000,000,000 in 1920 to \$45,000,000,000 in 1929. This represents a shrinkage in two items alone of farm property of \$21,000,000,000. The value of all livestock on farms in 1920 census has been given at \$8,012,876,000. The Department of Agriculture estimates that in 1930 this value had shrunk to \$5,864,969,000. The total income per farm family for capital, labor, and management in 1920 was \$1,246. By 1928 this had dropped to \$886. The average farmer earned less than 3 per cent on his net capital invested, whereas the average earning for all corporate industries was approximately 13 per cent in 1928. In 1928 the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue estimated the average annual income for the average person gainfully employed to be \$2,010, or a total annual income of \$90,000,000,000. How striking is the contrast with this high rate of income for the average citizen, and the average income of the farmer in 1928 of \$886. The inevitable result of such a condition is to drive people away from the farm into the already overcrowded industrial centers. The agricultural population on the 14th of March of this year was the smallest it had been in 20 years. The farm population has decreased practically 5,000,000 in the last 20 years. In this condition agriculture not alone suffers but industry as well loses a great and profitable market, and the social and political order of the country accordingly is disturbed beyond measure.

The President of the United States, realizing these conditions, recognized in his campaign the depressed condition of agriculture and appealed as a candidate to the country to give this job of rehabilitating the agricultural industry to the hands of the Republican Party because of its boasted superior efficiency in the matters of dispatching public business. Well, for better or for worse, the American people did just that thing. They gave this country a Republican President by a large majority, they gave this country a United States Senate with a majority of 16 Republicans, and they gave to the country a House with a majority of 100 Members. Certainly with the President of the United States and such workable majorities in both Houses of Congress the American people gave to the Republicans an unhampered opportunity of displaying its efficiency in the handling of the most irritating problem which has confronted this country since the World War.

On January 7, 1929, the House Ways and Means Committee, composed of 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats, began the tariff hearings. These hearings continued for seven weeks, or until February 27. After the hearings were over, in order that the so-called efficiency of the Republican machine, under the direction of its leaders, might function with the greatest of speed and precision, the 10 Democratic members were unceremoniously excused from a further participation in this farmers' tariff bill. Eleven hundred witnesses appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in seven weeks' time, between January 7 and February 27, and were examined and cross-examined by the 25 members of the committee. And yet it took the 15 Republican members from the 27th day of February to the 7th day of May, or 2 months and 10 days, with all the experts of the Tariff Commission at their command, to prepare a bill to present to this House. If we can believe even the mildest rumors which were caught from the executive sessions of our Republican brethren of that committee, their proceedings partook more of the nature of the "Kilkenny cats" than the spirit of a "love feast."

I want to here insert into the RECORD the names and the States of those 15 Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee:

HAWLEY, Oregon; TREADWAY, Massachusetts; BACHARACH, New Jersey; HADLEY, Washington; TIMBERLAKE, Colorado; WATSON, Pennsylvania; McLAUGHLIN, Michigan; KEARNS, Ohio; CHINDELOM, Illinois; CROWTHER, New York; ALDRICH, Rhode Island; ESTEP, Pennsylvania; RAMSEYER, Iowa; DAVENPORT, New York; FREAR, Wisconsin.

I hold in my hand the product of the combined genius of these architects of the farmers' tariff bill. This bill is composed of 434 pages. It has 183 sections. The first two sections alone of this bill contain 727 paragraphs. There are 10,681 lines in this bill. From the standpoint of size and verbosity, the farmer certainly had a right to expect some relief from this bill.

THE BILL CREATED A DISTURBANCE

When the Hawley bill was introduced in the House it created a furor from one end of the country to the other. Farm organizations manifested an open displeasure about the contents of the bill. And the press comments from all over the country were none too friendly. A press comment which went the rounds last summer and was gathered up in Republican circles with some degree of pride, was to the effect that the Hawley tariff bill had been the subject of some wonderful engineering as it passed through the House and designated the engineers thereof as the "Four Horsemen" of the tariff bill. The first of the "Four Horsemen" was our distinguished Speaker; the first lieutenant was our majority leader; the second lieutenant was the chairman of the Rules Committee; and the first sergeant of the "Four Horsemen" was none other than the congenial chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Now, whatever else may be said about this congenial group, it can not be said that they lack in intellectual strength, or that they faint at the suggestion that they are the friends of special interests. This group of leaders proceeded to bring in a rule which I shall insert in the extension of my remarks which for "gag" rule purposes has never had an equal since the days of Cannonism. Its practical effect was to permit only the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee to even introduce an amendment to the Hawley bill. Notwithstanding it took the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee 4 months and 17 days to consider and prepare the Hawley bill, the "Four Horsemen" said under this special rule that the other 420 Members of the House should have only four days for consideration of this bill for the relief of the American farmer.

The rule referred to is as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2667, entitled "A bill to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes"; that general debate on the bill be now closed; that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, but committee amendments to any part of the bill shall be in order at any time; that consideration of the bill for amendment shall continue until Tuesday, May 28, 1929, at 3 o'clock p. m., at which time the bill with all amendments that shall have been adopted by the Committee of the Whole shall be reported to the House, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The vote on all amendments shall be taken en gros except when a separate vote is demanded by the Committee on Ways and Means on an amendment offered by said committee.

That said bill shall be the continuing order until its consideration is concluded, subject only to conference reports, privileged matters on the Speaker's table, and reports from the Committee on Rules.

THIS RULE A TEST

Mr. RAGON. This rule presented the test as to whether a Member was serious in his protestations for farm relief. If a Member of Congress wanted to amend this bill all he had to do was to vote "nay" on the motion for the previous question on this rule. If the motion for the previous question was voted down, then the rule could be amended so as to extend the time for consideration of the bill and to propose any kind of amendment. If one voted "yea" on the motion for the previous question, then he foreclosed himself from offering any amendment. If he also voted "yea" on the rule, he not only foreclosed himself, but the other 434 Members of the House from offering amendments to the bill. The tragic position that the majority Members of the House now find themselves in is that they voluntarily stood up and voted "yea," which meant to hog tie themselves to the most unpopular tariff bill of recent years. When they voted "yea" upon the motion for previous question and "yea" upon the rule, they put themselves in the attitude where they could not even suggest an amendment to the tariff bill which put a tax on the farmer's sugar bowl, upon the shingles, lumber, brick, and cement which go into his buildings;

upon the steel and the wood that go into all his farm machinery; upon practically all of his wearing apparel, including his shoes. The bill even put a tax on his plowlines, hame strings, trace chains, rakes, hoes, and pitchforks, and hundreds of other things which go into the overhead expenses of the American farmer.

I want to insert at this point the record vote by States of each Member of Congress upon these two roll calls—the vote on the previous question and the vote on the rule.

| | Vote on previous question | Vote on adoption of rule |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Alabama: | | |
| McDuffie..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Hill..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Steagall..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Jeffers..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Patterson..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Oliver..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Algood..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Almon..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Huddleston..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Bankhead..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Arizona: Douglas..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Arkansas: | | |
| Driver..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Oldfield..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Fuller..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Wingo..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Ragon..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Glover..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Parks..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| California: | | |
| Lea..... | Yea..... | Not voting. |
| Englebright..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Curry..... | Yea (pair)..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Kahn..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Welch..... | Yea (pair)..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Carter..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Barbour..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Free..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Evans..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Crall..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Swing..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Colorado: | | |
| Eaton..... | Yea (pair)..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Timberlake..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hardy..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Taylor..... | Not voting..... | Not voting..... |
| Connecticut: | | |
| Fenn..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Freeman..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Tilson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Merritt..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Glynn..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Delaware: Houston..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Florida: | | |
| Drane..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Green..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Yon..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Owen..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Georgia: | | |
| Edwards..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Cox..... | Nay..... | Nay (pair)..... |
| Crisp..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Wright..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Steele..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Rutherford..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Tarver..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Brand..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Bell..... | Nay (pair)..... | Nay (pair)..... |
| Vinson..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Lankford..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Larsen..... | Nay (pair)..... | Nay (pair)..... |
| Idaho: | | |
| French..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Smith..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Illinois: | | |
| De Priest..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| M. D. Hull..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Sproul..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Doyle..... | Not voting..... | Not voting..... |
| Sabath..... | Not voting..... | Not voting..... |
| Igoe..... | Nay (pair)..... | Nay (pair)..... |
| Michaelson..... | Yea..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Kunz..... | Not voting..... | Not voting..... |
| Britten..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Chindblom..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Reid..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Buckbee..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Johnson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Allen..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| W. E. Hull..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hall..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Holaday..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Adkins..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Raney..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Raney..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Irwin..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Arnold..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Williams..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Denison..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Yates..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| McCormick..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Indiana: | | |
| Rowbottom..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Greenwood..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Dunbar..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Canfield..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Indiana—Continued. | | |
| Johnson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Elliott..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Ludlow..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Vestal..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Purnell..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Wood..... | Yea (pair)..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Hall..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hogg..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hickey..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Iowa: | | |
| Kopp..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Letts..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Robinson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Haugen..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Cole..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Ramseyer..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Dowell..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Thurston..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Swanson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Dickinson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Campbell..... | Yea..... | Nay..... |
| Kansas: | | |
| Lambertson..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Guyer..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Sproul..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Hoch..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Strong..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Sparks..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hope..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Ayres..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Kentucky: | | |
| Gregory..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Kincheloe..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Craddock..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Thatcher..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Newhall..... | Yea..... | Not voting..... |
| Blackburn..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Walker..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Kendall..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Langley..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Robison..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Louisiana: | | |
| O'Connor..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Spearing..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Sandlin..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Wilson..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Kemp..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| DeRouen..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Aswell..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Maine: | | |
| Beedy..... | Yea..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| White..... | Not recorded..... | Not recorded..... |
| Nelson..... | Yea..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Snow..... | Yea..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Maryland: | | |
| Goldsborough..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Clark..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Palmisano..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Linthicum..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Gambrell..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Zihlman..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Massachusetts: | | |
| Treadway..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Kaynor..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Foss..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Stobbs..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Rogers..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Andrew..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Connery..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Dallinger..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Underhill..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Douglas..... | Not voting..... | Not voting..... |
| Tinkham..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| McCormack..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Luce..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Wigglesworth..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Martin..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Gifford..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Michigan: | | |
| Clancy..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Michener..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hooper..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Ketcham..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Mapes..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Hudson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Cramton..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Vincent..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| McLaughlin..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Woodruff..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Bohn..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| James..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| McLeod..... | Yea (pair)..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Minnesota: | | |
| Christgau..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Clague..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Andresen..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Maas..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Newton..... | Not voting..... | Not voting..... |
| Kvale..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Pittenger..... | Yea..... | Yea (pair)..... |
| Knutson..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Selvig..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Goodwin..... | Yea..... | Yea..... |
| Mississippi: | | |
| Rankin..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Doxey..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Whittington..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Busby..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |
| Collins..... | Nay..... | Nay..... |

| | Vote on previous question | Vote on adoption of rule |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mississippi—Continued. | | |
| Hall | Nay | Nay |
| Quinn | Nay | Nay |
| Collier | Nay | Nay |
| Missouri: | | |
| Romjue | Nay | Nay |
| Lozier | Nay | Nay |
| Milligan | Nay | Nay |
| Hopkins | Yea | Yea |
| Ellis | Yea | Yea |
| Halsey | Yea | Yea |
| Palmer | Yea | Yea |
| Nelson | Nay | Nay |
| Cannon | Nay | Nay |
| Niedringhaus | Yea | Yea |
| Cochran | Nay | Nay |
| Dyer | Yea | Yea |
| Kieffer | Yea | Yea |
| Short | Yea | Yea |
| Manlove | Yea | Yea |
| Johnston | Yea | Yea |
| Montana: | | |
| Evans | Nay | Nay |
| Leavitt | Yea | Yea |
| Nebraska: | | |
| Morehead | Nay | Nay |
| Sears | Yea | Yea |
| Howard | Nay | Nay |
| Sloan | Yea | Yea |
| Johnson | Yea | Yea |
| Simmons | Yea | Yea |
| Nevada: Arentz | Yea | Yea |
| New Hampshire: | | |
| Hale | Yea | Yea |
| Wason | Yea | Yea |
| New Jersey: | | |
| Wolverton | Yea | Yea |
| Bacharach | Yea | Yea |
| Hoffman | Yea | Yea (pair) |
| Eaton | Yea | Yea |
| Ackerman | Yea | Yea |
| Perkins | Yea | Yea |
| Seger | Yea | Yea |
| Hartley | Yea | Yea |
| Fort | Yea | Yea |
| Lehibach | Yea | Yea |
| Auf der Heide | Nay | Nay |
| Norton | Nay | Nay |
| New Mexico: Simms | Yea | Yea |
| New York: | | |
| Bacon | Yea | Yea |
| Brunner | Nay | Nay |
| Lindsay | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Cullen | Not voting | Nay (pair) |
| Black | Nay | Nay |
| Somers | Not voting | Nay (pair) |
| Quayle | Nay | Nay |
| Carley | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| O'Connell | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Celler | Not voting | Not voting |
| Prall | Not voting | Nay (pair) |
| Dickstein | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Sullivan | Not recorded | Not recorded |
| Shovich | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Boylan | Nay | Nay |
| O'Connor | Not voting | Nay (pair) |
| Ruth Pratt | Yea | Yea |
| Carew | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Bloom | Nay | Nay |
| LaGuardia | Nay | Nay |
| Griffin | Not voting | Nay (pair) |
| Oliver | Nay | Nay |
| Fitzpatrick | Nay | Nay |
| Wainwright | Yea | Yea |
| Fish | Yea | Yea |
| H. J. Pratt | Yea | Yea |
| Corning | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Parker | Yea | Yea |
| Crowther | Yea | Yea (pair) |
| Snell | Yea | Yea |
| Culkin | Yea | Yea |
| Davenport | Yea | Yea |
| Clarke | Yea | Yea |
| Hancock | Yea | Yea |
| Taber | Yea | Yea |
| Stalker | Yea | Yea |
| Whitley | Yea | Yea |
| Sanders | Yea | Yea |
| Dempsey | Yea | Yea |
| Cooke | Yea | Not voting |
| Mead | Not voting | Not voting |
| Reed | Yea | Yea |
| North Carolina: | | |
| Warren | Nay | Nay |
| Kerr | Nay | Nay |
| Abernethy | Nay | Nay |
| Pou | Nay | Nay |
| Stedman | Not voting | Not voting |
| Clark | Nay | Nay |
| Hammer | Nay | Nay |
| Doughton | Nay | Nay |
| Jonas | Yea | Yea |
| Pritchard | Yea | Yea |
| North Dakota: | | |
| Burtess | Yea | Yea |
| Hall | Yea | Yea |
| Sinclair | Yea | Yea |
| Ohio: | | |
| Hess | Yea | Yea |
| Fitzgerald | Yea (pair) | Yea (pair) |
| Cable | Yea | Yea |

| | Vote on previous question | Vote on adoption of rule |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ohio—Continued. | | |
| Thompson | Yea | Yea |
| Kearns | Yea | Yea |
| Brand | Yea | Yea |
| Mouser | Yea | Yea |
| Chalmers | Yea | Yea |
| Jenkins | Yea | Yea |
| Underwood | Nay | Nay |
| Speaks | Yea | Yea |
| Baird | Yea | Yea |
| Seiberling | Yea | Yea |
| Moore | Yea | Yea |
| McClintock | Yea | Yea |
| Morgan | Yea | Yea |
| Murphy | Yea | Yea |
| Cooper | Yea | Yea |
| Mooney | Nay | Not voting |
| Crosser | Nay | Nay |
| Bolton | Yea | Yea |
| Oklahoma: | | |
| O'Connor | Yea | Yea |
| Hastings | Nay | Nay |
| Cartwright | Nay | Nay |
| McKeown | Nay | Nay |
| Stone | Yea | Yea |
| Johnson | Nay | Nay |
| McClintic | Nay (pair) | Nay (pair) |
| Garber | Yea | Yea |
| Oregon: | | |
| Hawley | Yea | Yea |
| Butler | Yea | Yea |
| Korell | Yea | Yea |
| Pennsylvania: | | |
| Beck | Yea | Not voting |
| Graham | Yea | Yea |
| Ransley | Yea | Yea |
| Golder | Yea (pair) | Yea (pair) |
| Connolly | Yea | Yea |
| Welsh | Yea | Yea |
| Darrow | Yea | Yea |
| Woffenden | Yea | Yea |
| Watson | Yea | Yea |
| Griest | Yea (pair) | Yea (pair) |
| Watres | Yea | Yea |
| Brumm | Yea | Yea |
| Esterly | Yea | Yea |
| McFadden | Yea (pair) | Yea (pair) |
| Kiess | Yea | Yea |
| Magrady | Yea | Yea |
| Beers | Yea | Yea |
| Doutrich | Yea (pair) | Yea (pair) |
| Leech | Yea | Yea |
| Kurtz | Yea | Yea |
| Menges | Yea | Yea |
| Chase | Yea | Yea |
| Kendall | Yea (pair) | Yea (pair) |
| Temple | Yea | Yea |
| Swick | Yea | Yea |
| Strong | Yea | Yea |
| Cochran | Yea | Yea |
| Shreve | Yea | Yea |
| Coyle | Yea | Yea |
| Wyant | Yea | Yea |
| Porter | Yea | Yea |
| Kelly | Yea | Yea |
| Sullivan | Yea | Yea |
| Estep | Yea | Yea |
| Campbell | Yea | Yea |
| Rhode Island: | | |
| Burdick | Yea | Yea |
| Aldrich | Yea | Yea |
| O'Connell | Nay | Nay |
| South Carolina: | | |
| McMillan | Nay | Nay (pair) |
| Hare | Nay | Nay |
| Dominick | Nay | Nay |
| McSwain | Nay | Nay |
| Stevenson | Not voting | Not voting |
| Gasque | Nay | Nay |
| Fulmer | Nay | Nay |
| South Dakota: | | |
| Christopherson | Yea | Nay |
| Johnson | Yea | Yea |
| Williamson | Yea | Yea |
| Tennessee: | | |
| Reece | Yea | Yea |
| Taylor | Yea | Yea |
| McReynolds | Nay | Nay |
| Hull | Nay | Nay |
| Davis | Nay | Nay |
| Byrns | Nay | Nay |
| Estick | Nay | Nay |
| Browning | Nay | Nay |
| Cooper | Nay | Nay |
| Fisher | Nay | Nay |
| Texas: | | |
| Patman | Nay | Nay |
| Box | Nay | Nay |
| Sanders | Nay | Nay |
| Rayburn | Nay | Nay |
| Summers | Nay | Nay |
| Johnson | Nay | Nay |
| Briggs | Nay | Nay |
| Garrett | Nay | Nay |
| Mansfield | Nay | Nay |
| Buchanan | Nay | Nay |
| Cross | Nay | Nay |
| Lanham | Not voting | Not voting |
| Williams | Nay | Nay |
| McCloskey | Nay | Nay |
| Garner | Nay | Nay |

| | Vote on previous question | Vote on adoption of rule |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Texas—Continued. | | |
| Hudspeth | Nay | Nay. |
| Lee | Nay | Nay. |
| Jones | Nay | Nay. |
| Utah: | | |
| Colton | Yea | Yea. |
| Leatherwood | Yea | Yea. |
| Vermont: | | |
| Brigham | Yea | Yea. |
| Gibson | Yea | Yea. |
| Virginia: | | |
| Bland | Nay | Nay. |
| Lankford | Yea | Yea. |
| Montague | Nay | Nay. |
| Drewry | Nay | Nay. |
| Whitehead | Nay | Nay. |
| Woodrum | Nay | Nay. |
| Garber | Yea | Yea. |
| Moore | Not voting | Not voting. |
| Shaffer | Yea | Yea. |
| Tucker | Nay | Nay. |
| Washington: | | |
| Miller | Yea | Yea. |
| Hadley | Yea | Yea. |
| Johnson | Yea | Yea. |
| Summers | Yea | Yea. |
| Hill | Nay | Nay. |
| West Virginia: | | |
| Bachmann | Yea | Yea. |
| Bowman | Yea | Yea. |
| Wolverton | Yea | Yea. |
| Hughes | Yea | Yea. |
| Shott | Yea | Yea. |
| Smith | Nay | Nay. |
| Wisconsin: | | |
| Cooper | Nay | Nay. |
| Kading | Yea | Yea. |
| Nelson | Yea | Nay. |
| Schafer | Yea | Yea. |
| Stafford | Nay | Nay. |
| Lampert | Nay | Nay. |
| Hull | Nay | Nay. |
| Browne | Nay | Nay. |
| Schneider | Nay | Nay. |
| Frear | Not voting | Not voting. |
| Peavey | Not recorded | Not recorded. |
| Wyoming: Carter | | |
| | Yea | Yea. |

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1877 (May 24, 1929):

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Yea | 248 |
| Nays | 138 |
| Paired yea | 11 |
| Paired nay | 11 |

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 1877-1878 (May 24, 1929):

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Yea | 234 |
| Nays | 138 |
| Paired yea | 18 |
| Paired nay | 18 |

I want every American farmer and every American consumer in this country to know exactly the names of those Representatives who by their voluntary vote put themselves in a position where they could not even offer to a farmer's tariff bill a single amendment which would be beneficial to the farmers and consumers of this country.

TIME BILL ACTUALLY CONSIDERED

Under the "gag" rule provided by the Four Horsemen the House gave to this bill, which vitally affects the family budgets of 120,000,000 people, 27,000,000 of whom are farmers, the following consideration:

Friday, May 24, 4 hours and 36 minutes; Saturday, May 25, 5 hours and 25 minutes; Monday, May 27, 6 hours and 5 minutes; Tuesday, May 28, 3 hours. In all, 19 hours and 6 minutes. If you take out the time for the debate on the rule and the reading of the Journal, you will actually have less than 18 hours given to the consideration of this bill, when to have considered in its entirety would have meant the reading and consideration of more than 24 pages per hour. The fact of record is that of the 10,681 lines in the Hawley bill only 82 of them were read and considered. Of the 727 paragraphs contained in the first and second sections of the bill only 6 of them were read and considered. Of the 183 sections contained in the bill only a small fraction of one of the sections was read and considered. There were only 4 pages of 434 in the bill given any consideration. As a fitting climax to this legislative horse-play which characterized the conduct of this bill through its entire consideration by the House the Clerk read as a part of the meager consideration of this bill paragraph 2, which I now ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 2. Acetaldehyde, aldol or acetaldol, aldehyde ammonia, butyraldehyde, crotonaldehyde, paracetaldehyde; ethylene chlorohydrin, propylene chlorohydrin, butylene chlorohydrin; ethylene dichloride, propylene dichloride, butylene dichloride; ethylene oxide, propylene oxide, butylene oxide; ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, butylene glycol, and all other glycols or dihydric alcohols; monoethanolamine, dietha-

nolamine, triethanolamine, ethylene diamine, and all other hydroxy alkyl amines and alkylene diamines; allyl alcohol, crotonyl alcohol, vinyl alcohol, and all other olefin or unsaturated alcohols; homologues and polymers of all the foregoing; ethers, esters, salts, and nitrogenous compounds of any of the foregoing, whether polymerized or unpolymerized; and mixtures in chief value of any one or more of the foregoing; all the foregoing not specially provided for, 6 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.

[Laughter and applause.]

A REPUBLICAN VIEW OF OUR LEADERSHIP

Mr. RAGON. Upon this floor during the tariff debate, on May 16, a gentleman from Maine, in speaking of the leadership of the majority, said:

The relation between the Ways and Means Committee and the Members of the House which exists now is something akin to that of the king and his subjects.

Of course, he had reference only to the Republican members of that committee. Just before he made this statement the same gentleman, who frequently manifests the spirit of a free man, said:

I want to suggest there are a good many farmers in New England who are apparently forgotten by the Ways and Means Committee.

A witness by the name of GRUNDY, a noted tariff lobbyist, commenting on the methods of tariff making, in effect said that the industry of the country only had to see a few men in the House in order to get the tariff rates they wanted. Judging from what transpired in the passage of this arbitrary rule and the consideration of this important tariff bill, the public is justified in concluding that the deliberations of Congress, at least upon the tariff bill, was directed and controlled by a number who might be confined to so small a circle as the "Four Horsemen." The first lieutenant of the "Four Horsemen" in a newspaper interview said that the rule adopted would permit the Ways and Means Committee to introduce amendments, and not allow amendments to be introduced by every Tom, Dick, and Harry.

Shortly after this statement was made this same witness, GRUNDY, testifying before the lobby committee, said that the Senators from certain so-called backward States should have little to say and talk "darn low" on tariff legislation in the Senate. Is there not a close affinity of thought between the leader of the majority here in the House and the leader of the tariff barons of the country when they would withhold the voice of sovereign States in the Senate and the rank and file of the peoples' representatives in the House in the consideration of important legislation? There is another interesting affinity in this: The Toms, Dicks, and Harrys in the House and the backward Senators in the Senate represent in the main nothing but agricultural State. Therefore, using these statements as a basis, I think we are justified in saying that the leadership of the House is so saturated with Grundyism that it has not the proper sympathy with the interest of the agricultural people of this country.

PSEUDO-REPUBLICANS IN THE SENATE

After the Hawley bill had spent practically five months in its preparation by the Ways and Means Committee and then 18 hours in its consideration by the House, it was taken to the Republican Senate on May 29, 1929. I am not particularly interested in what happened to it in the Senate further than to call attention to the developments arising out of the House's immature consideration of the bill. From one end of the country to the other there arose a cry against the bill. There was not a farm organization in the country but what was dissatisfied with its provisions. Practically the same was true of every industry in the country, except those in the East and along the Atlantic seaboard. I do not recall having read a single newspaper editorial in this country which indorsed the bill in its entirety. Thirty or more foreign countries immediately protested to our Government against these rates which provided almost an embargo upon foreign goods. Several nations threatened and some put into effect retaliatory tariffs.

In this unhappy and unfortunate condition, the American farmer, whose industry has more exports than any other single industry was again the greatest sufferer. Upon the shoulders of the Democratic Members of the United States Senate fell the burden of leading the fight against this legislative monstrosity. In that body there were men of Republican faith who insisted that the purpose of the special session be carried out to the letter. They represented great agricultural States. With their own lips they had preached industrial prosperity from one end of this country to the other in the fall of 1928, and attributed this prosperity to the terms of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. In their efforts to be patriots before partisans, and to

fulfill a solemn promise to the American farmer to build up his prosperity they have called down upon themselves the displeasure of every Grundyite in the country, and a steady effort is being made to discredit their work in order to keep the eyes of the public from the outrageous industrial rates incorporated in the Hawley bill.

The United States Senate has done nothing within the last 25 years which ought to commend it more to the people of this country than their act of dissection and bringing to light the nefarious schemes which are incorporated in the Hawley bill, which was given only 18 hours' consideration by our august body. Some one had to pull the lid off, expose the sham, and this the United States Senate courageously and fearlessly did. It should have been done in the House, and it would have been done in the House if our Republican Members had not stood still and supinely permitted themselves to be harnessed about with "gag" rules which would not permit them to speak the honest sentiments of their soul.

TARIFF DELAY DUE TO REPUBLICANS

Members of both factions of the majority party by blaming each other undertake to excuse themselves for the long delay in the enactment of the tariff. The fact is that if the Hawley bill had been given the consideration by the House which it should have been given we would have been through with the tariff bill many months ago. But of whatever benefit a tariff bill may be to business, business has had to wait; industry has had to mark time and the exports from this country for January and February are more than \$150,000,000 under the same periods of last year. All of these things occurring while the efficient Republican Congress explains to the business and professional men and the farmers of the country the controversial cause for their failure to dispatch public business with promptness and efficiency.

A distinguished West Virginian put into the RECORD the names of those pseudo-Republicans of the Senate who have occasionally been guilty of joining with the Democrats. I shall put into the RECORD here his list of Senators:

BORAH, Idaho; BLAINE, Wisconsin; BROOKHART, Iowa; CUTTING, New Mexico; FRAZIER, North Dakota; NORRIS, Nebraska; HOWELL, Nebraska; LA FOLLETTE, Wisconsin; MCMASTER, South Dakota; NORBECK, South Dakota; NYE, North Dakota; PINE, Oklahoma; SCHALL, Minnesota.

Now, every one of these Senators had they been Members of the House would have voted "nay" on the motion for the previous question and on the rules. How most of the Congressmen from the States represented by these Senators will satisfy their constituents that their vote "yea" on the vote for the previous question and the rule was a correct vote presents a worrisome problem.

It is amusing to observe the name which heads this list. Whether it was BORAH in Boston, or BORAH in Dallas, or BORAH in Minneapolis in the fall of 1928 he was both the oracle of the Republican Party and the flaming evangel of its tenets. There were no sons of wild jackasses then, no "pseudo" Republicans, because they were trying to get the vote of the American people. They were all Republicans then, good and true, and the American business men and the American farmer are liable to still remember them to-day as the same Republicans who brought to them the glowing promise of agricultural relief and a better condition for business expansion.

Why do not the standpatters and the "pseudo" Republicans undertake to get some arbiter to decide which faction has the proper conception of Republican rates for a tariff bill? Why make the American farmer and the American business man stand by and suffer through all of these long and weary months while Republican factions in the House and in the Senate whip themselves threadbare in a fight upon one another? Surely they should feel no hesitancy in going down to the White House and there asking their leader to interpret for them the real Republican mind on the tariff. And surely, for the sake of the farmers and the business men, this leader would feel no hesitancy in telling them whether he believes in the rates of the standpatters or the rates of the "pseudo" Republicans.

However much any blame may attach to the other body of Congress, it ill behooves any member of the majority party in this House to criticize it. For with all of the activities of the Grundys, the Eyansons, the sugar lobbyists, and all the "scalawagery" practiced by the various and sundry lobby organizations, still the Senate refused to surrender its prerogatives of maturely considering a bill and offering amendments thereto. But not so of those Members of the House from agricultural districts. They did not wait for any of this new-fangled legislative racketeering to be practiced upon them. They abjectly surrendered before the enemy had time to even fire a gun. [Applause.]

THE WARNING

The minority leader [Mr. GARNER] warned the Members the other day of the consequences of blindly submitting to the "gag" rule in the consideration of the bill which comes to us now from the Senate. He did this in the hope that at some time or other this tariff bill would receive some consideration at the hands of this House. If my leader is nursing any hope whatsoever that the "Four Horsemen" of this House will permit a thorough consideration of the bill which comes to us from the Senate, then he is doomed to a great disillusionment. If anyone believes that this bill is due to receive serious consideration, then he is possessed of a faith with which he might easily walk waters. Except you become as a little child and believe again in Santa Claus and Easter rabbits, you can not believe that those who engineered the Hawley bill through this House last May will capitulate and permit a consideration of this bill.

This House was warned time and again last May before the House took up the Hawley bill, but these warnings were contemptuously ignored. I would finally say to my leader that it is a compliment to the bigness of his heart that he should insist that this bill be now considered, but he certainly is some optimist if he believes any heed will be given his request.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE FEATURES OF TARIFF BILL

Mr. Speaker, there never was a time in the history of this country when there was more need for a strong and aggressive minority than there is to-day. It has always been a minority to which the people have looked for aid and for comfort when the days grew dark, because of mismanagement of our Government. I want to see our minority here in the House, not through coalition but through independent action, set a course upon such rates and administrative features as we may be permitted to vote upon, if at all, which will inspire the confidence of the sensible and unselfish agriculturists and industrialists of the country. [Applause.] For the minority to stand unitedly behind such a program it will encourage those of progressive thought in this House who refused to be "gag" ruled to seek a more congenial company and join forces with us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have such time as he may need to finish his remarks.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 20 minutes additional, and that, following me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] may have 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAGON. Personally I do not like the idea of legislation which provides for a debenture, because I would first avoid the necessity for such legislation. Reluctantly I voted to attach it to the farm bill, but how any man, in view of the present tariff rates which are on the statutes and which come to us in the Senate bill, can justify a vote against the debenture for the American farmer is entirely beyond my comprehension. [Applause.] It has been nothing but a Republican doctrine since the inception of this Government, sponsored first by Hamilton and then later by so distinguished a man as Henry Clay. These real statesmen announced the policy that the debenture for agriculture was indispensable where industrial rates were high. I know many men on the floor of this House feel as I do about the debenture. But I do believe that under the present conditions that the debenture belongs in a tariff bill and it should be put there as an instrument for the use of the Farm Board or the President.

FLEXIBLE CLAUSE

I believe and hope that every member of the minority party will support the Senate amendment with reference to the debenture and flexible clause. This flexible clause has been converted into a political use whereby a Member of Congress may use it as an alibi or for buck-passing purposes in getting around a bad reason for some of his votes. Many a weak-kneed brother has been brought to full strength by the soft whisper in his ear of some leader that his vote upon a particular rate or a particular schedule will amount to naught because "we can leave it to the President, and he will lower or increase the rates as our people want." Then if the folks back home do not get what they want in the way of a tariff, the Member blames it upon the President. This is a small objection compared to the fundamental object which has been so ably discussed here many times.

It is well for us to remember that it is history as old as our Constitution that a power or authority once yielded to a coordinate branch of the Government is difficult to have returned. The House, of all other bodies and organizations, should be the

one most jealous with reference to the exercise of power relating to our revenues. There was a great purpose in the minds of the framers of the Constitution when they brushed aside all others and laid primarily the responsibilities of the taxing powers of the Government in the hands of the House of Representatives. Why any party or any administration would want to put additional power in the hands of an already overworked Executive is something I do not understand.

In view of all of this procedure, which scarcely approaches the dignity of a joke, put over by the House with a Republican majority of over 100, it certainly does not now lie in the mouth of any Republican to say that the Democratic membership of the House, completely tied out under the rules, failed to do anything against or contribute anything to the making of a better tariff bill than the one we have. I would say to the Republican Members who feign to feel this way that this is one time you can not get by your constituents by passing the buck to the Democratic Party.

SUCH PROCEDURE ALMOST TRAGIC

Our procedure to give relief to agriculture through a tariff bill would be absolutely humorous if it were not so tragic. What is to be the outcome of those agricultural sections with their little agricultural towns of 5,000 people and less? What has been their contribution to this Nation's history? When you make lean their pocketbooks you incidentally disturb their social and political conditions and these spiritual forces more than any trade or commerce have been the means by which America has become the foremost nation of the earth.

Back in the early history of this country when we only had a population of a few million people, Thomas Jefferson called upon a distinguished Frenchman to lay out a plan for national education for this country. At that time this country had no large cities, but only villages and farm communities, in fact it was nothing but a rural country. I am not interested in the Frenchman's plan of education, but I would call your attention to an expression made by that Frenchman in the preface of his report. He said that America was the best-educated nation on the face of the earth; that only 4 out of every 1,000 adults was unable to read, and to write legibly his own name. He said further that this Nation was destined to become one of the leading nations of the earth, due to this education and the things about which the people read. He said that in the evening the family would gather around the fireside and the father and mother would first read, and then it would be given to the oldest son or daughter, and so on down the line until practically the entire family had been given the opportunity to read. He then said the literature they read was of the finest type procurable at that time. And that upon the center table of the home there was to be found the family Bible from which the evening's reading was concluded. Is it a wonder that from this environment came the finest characters of Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, the Adamses, John Marshall, and others, characters the like of which no nation could ever boast?

Whatever may be said or whatever may be done on the floor of this House you can not remedy or rewrite the history of the past. And that history will impress upon the mind of every schoolboy of this time that the fine spiritual forces which conceived and brought forth and nurtured this country to its present greatness came not from the thrill of the back alleys and the industrial centers but it came from the romances of the backwoods. [Applause.] It has been from the rural section in practically every decade in this Nation's history that our outstanding leadership has been drawn. More than two-thirds of the Presidents of the United States have either come from the humble environments of the farmer's home or have been the sons of some small-town preacher. Supreme courts, senates, diplomatic corps, all open their archives to give abundant testimony to the same effect.

I recall my experience when I witnessed the first inauguration of a President in 1924. I was very much impressed with the great congregation of diplomats, American statesmen, great concourse of people; and then I thrilled as I saw coming down the steps of the Capitol the President of the United States, followed by the gracious first lady of the land. But back of the President and his wife there came a sturdy old New Englander, who I judge had passed his fourscore years. His feeble frame showed that once he had borne a strong and powerful body. His piercing eyes never varied to the right or the left as he came down to take his place assigned to him in the ceremonies. Who was this person? He was the father of the man who was shortly to hold up his right hand and take the oath of office as the leader of the greatest nation on earth. And this father nothing but a farmer and old-fashioned doctor from the rural sections of New England.

As I go through the little town of Staunton, Va., I never fail to drive down the street where there is a little white house,

which I judge cost no more than from \$500 to \$1,000 when it was constructed. I go by there because there once lived a Presbyterian preacher. And in this house was born a son, and this son, without luxury of wealth but with the heritage of a strong man and good character, beat his way to the top in American life and finally became the leader of this country at the most crucial hours of its history.

America was proud of her President when she saw him go down the streets of London and saw the haughty Britisher give him an acclaim the like of which was never before heard on British soil. They then saw him in Paris, where the impetuous Frenchmen almost begged to touch his garments as he passed by, so intense was their admiration and love. And then in Rome he heard their praise to himself and his country in tongues and voices which were strangers to his understanding. Nevertheless he knew it was the outpourings of a sincere sentiment upon the part of the country which had drawn heavily upon the resources of himself and his people. And who was this man? He was the President of the United States and the greatest world figure who has walked the earth since the lowly Nazarene. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I have given these two men as fair examples of the contribution in recent years of the rural sections, in which I live and in which I have always lived, to this great country of ours.

You can put all the Grundys in the universe in the small balance of one scale and put the character of a Woodrow Wilson and of a Coolidge in the other, and the character of these two men will outweigh all of them, because, gentlemen, I say to you that the spiritual forces of America have always been and will ever be the forces that attracts young manhood, and as it ripens into age attracts the reverence and respect of old age. This is the cause I plead for to-day, and, my friends, I say to you that it will be a sad day in America if the tariff theories of my friend from New York, Doctor CROWTHER, ever prevail over the tariff theories of some of the men he has denounced, because whenever that happens you sound the death knell of the beautiful romance that you can find only in the backwoods of American life. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, my colleague and fellow committee member from Arkansas always tries to be fair. He always tells me that he tries to be fair, but, of course, in making an intensely partisan speech that is to be sent out for distribution and largely for campaign purposes, he is apt to depart from his conception of fairness and allow his imagination to run riot.

This speech we have listened to is a sequel to the "Calamity Jane" speech delivered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] over the radio recently; and its title should have been "Tennessee Blues." [Laughter.]

In the first place, I think it is hypocritical and inconsistent for a member of the Democratic Party to stand on this floor, in view of their traditional failures in tariff making and the absolute lack of consideration they displayed for the farmer in the Underwood-Simmons bill, to criticize the present tariff bill. I do not think my good friend was a Member of the House at the time the Underwood-Simmons bill was passed.

That establishes his alibi. And yet he might square himself with the excuse that even if he had been here he would not have voted for it. But the Democratic caucus was functioning then, as it is now, and you would have voted for it.

Every man, woman, and child on the farms in this country knows that the Democratic Party in writing the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill gave the farmer absolutely no consideration whatever. Allow me to present the proof of this statement. Here is the comparison of agricultural rates contained in the Underwood bill and the Fordney-McCumber bill. Compare the rates and you will see how little comfort the American farmer received from his would-be friends of Democratic faith. They came to the conclusion that nearly all the really great agricultural States were largely Republican States and that to help the farmers was not good political strategy. This table of comparative rates ought to be pasted in the hat of every Democrat who suggests that the Republican Congress is not doing its level best to aid agriculture.

| Commodity | Act of 1922, Fordney-McCumber | Act of 1913, Underwood-Simmons |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Beef and veal, fresh..... | 3 cents per pound..... | Free. |
| Live cattle..... | 1½ and 2 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Oleo oil..... | 1 cent per pound..... | 15 per cent. |
| Oleo stearin..... |do..... | Free. |
| Tallow..... | ½ cent per pound..... | Do. |
| Goats..... | \$2 per head..... | Do. |
| Fresh lamb..... | 4 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Fresh mutton..... | 2½ cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Sheep..... | \$2 per head..... | Do. |

| Commodity | Act of 1922, Fordney-McCumber | Act of 1913, Underwood-Simmons |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Bacon and hams..... | 1 cent per pound..... | Free. |
| Lard..... | 2 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Lard compounds and substitu- tures..... | 4 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Fresh pork..... | 3/4 cent per pound..... | Do. |
| Pork shoulders..... | 2 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Swine..... | 3/4 cent per pound..... | Do. |
| Extract of meat..... | 15 cents per pound..... | 10 cents per pound. |
| Fluid..... | do..... | 5 cents per pound. |
| Fresh meats..... | 20 per cent..... | Free. |
| Cream..... | 20 cents per gallon..... | Do. |
| Cream powder..... | 7 cents per pound..... | Not dutiable. |
| Malted milk..... | 20 per cent..... | Free. |
| Condensed milk, sweetened..... | 1 1/2 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Condensed milk, unsweet- ened..... | 1 cent per pound..... | Do. |
| Skimmed milk powder..... | 1 1/4 cents per pound..... | Not dutiable. |
| Whole milk powder..... | 3 cents per pound..... | Free. |
| Butter ¹ | 8 cents per pound..... | 2 1/2 cents per pound. |
| Oleomargarine..... | do..... | Free. |
| Cheese..... | 5 cents per pound..... | 20 per cent. |
| Live poultry..... | 3 cents per pound..... | 1 cent per pound. |
| Dressed poultry..... | 6 cents per pound..... | 2 cents per pound. |
| Dried egg albumen..... | 16 cents per pound..... | 3 cents per pound. |
| Frozen egg albumen..... | 6 cents per pound..... | 1 cent per pound. |
| Dried egg yolk..... | 18 cents per pound..... | 10 per cent. |
| Frozen egg yolk..... | 6 cents per pound..... | Free. |
| Eggs of poultry in shell..... | 8 cents per dozen..... | Do. |
| Dried whole eggs..... | 18 cents per pound..... | 10 cents per pound. |
| Frozen whole eggs..... | 6 cents per pound..... | 2 cents per pound. |
| Barley..... | 20 cents per bushel..... | 15 cents per bushel. |
| Buckwheat..... | 10 cents per 100 pounds..... | Free. |
| Corn..... | 15 cents per bushel..... | Do. |
| Corn meal..... | 30 cents per 100 pounds..... | Do. |
| Oats..... | 15 cents per bushel..... | 6 cents per bushel. |
| Unhulled ground oats..... | 45 cents per 100 pounds..... | 30 cents per 100 pounds. |
| Rice (brown hulls removed)..... | 1 1/4 cents per pound..... | 3/4 cent per pound. |
| Rice flour..... | 1/2 cent per pound..... | 1/4 cent per pound. |
| Milled rice (bran removed)..... | 2 cents per pound..... | 1 cent per pound. |
| Paddy or rough (rice)..... | 1 cent per pound..... | 3/4 cent per pound. |
| Rye..... | 15 cents per bushel..... | Free. |
| Rye flour..... | 45 cents per 100 pounds..... | Do. |
| Wheat ² | 30 cents per bushel..... | Do. |
| Crushed or cracked Flour and semolina..... | 78 cents per 100 pounds..... | Do. |
| Cocoanuts..... | 3/4 cent each..... | Do. |
| Peanuts, not shelled..... | 3 cents per pound..... | 3/4 cent per pound. |
| Shelled peanuts..... | 4 cents per pound..... | 5/4 cent per pound. |
| Castor beans..... | 3/4 cent per pound..... | 15 cents per bushel. |
| Cottonseed..... | 3/4 cent per pound..... | Free. |
| Flaxseed..... | 40 cents per bushel..... | 20 cents per bushel. |
| Poppy seed..... | 32 cents per 100 pounds..... | 15 cents per bushel. |
| Soybeans..... | 1/2 cent per pound..... | Free. |
| Alfalfa seed..... | 4 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Alsike clover seed..... | do..... | Do. |
| Crimson clover seed..... | 1 cent per pound..... | Do. |
| Sweetclover seed..... | 2 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Red clover seed..... | 4 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| White clover seed..... | 3 cents per pound..... | Do. |
| Dried beans..... | 1 1/4 cents per pound..... | 25 cents per bushel. |
| Dried peas..... | 1 cent per pound..... | 10 cents per bushel. |
| Tomato paste..... | 40 per cent..... | 25 per cent. |
| Turnips..... | 12 cents per 100 pounds..... | 15 per cent. |
| Hay..... | \$4 per ton..... | \$2 per ton. |
| Straw..... | \$1 per ton..... | 50 cents per ton. |
| Sugar..... | \$0.0176 per pound..... | \$0.01005 per pound. |
| Wool..... | 12 to 31 cents per pound..... | Free. |

¹ Tariff on butter increased by Tariff Commission to 12 cents per pound.

² Tariff on wheat increased to 42 cents.

But our Democratic brethren always say, "If you let this flood of merchandise in from Europe, see how much cheaper the consumer will buy the product." Well, we ask you this question: With industry marking time and imports displacing domestic products and no pay roll, how is the American citizen going to purchase these commodities?

I remember that in the Taft and Sherman campaign one of the speakers said, "My grandfather could have bought the whole of Manhattan Island for \$10 and a pair of rubber boots," and he was asked, "Why in the devil did he not buy it," and he said, "Because he did not have the \$10 nor the pair of rubber boots." [Laughter.]

That was the situation under the Democratic low-tariff policy—our workers did not have the \$10 nor the rubber boots.

Now, my friend speaks of the gag rule or the gag law. Well, of course, that is good material to use in a stump speech, and explain how their hands were tied and lips sealed, so that individual amendments could not be offered. The gentleman from Arkansas knows how to make that kind of a speech, and he has performed in a mighty creditable manner to-day. But somehow the speech does not sound like him, and departs from his declared attitude of fairness. The gentleman knows that the method of passing the Hawley bill in the House is the exact method used by both parties in years past.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. No; I can not yield at this time. I have only 10 minutes. I always delight to have my friend from Mississippi ask me a question, or any other Member of the House, and I am glad to answer questions so far as it is within

my ability. I always have the disposition, but not always the ability.

Now, do you realize that if we had considered the tariff bill and allowed general discussion of all the items and every amendment to the 21,000 or more items it would have taken five years to pass the tariff bill in this House?

Everybody knows that is not the way to do it, and Mr. GARNER, who has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a long time, helped to define the policy as to the method of passing the Underwood bill, and was the Hon. Claude Kitchin's right bower. They knew how to do it. They did not ask anybody on the Republican side about it. It was a method that had been used for half a century at least, and there was nothing new about it and there is no reason for condemning it now. It is a plain, sane, practical way of passing legislation that is necessary for the advancement of industrial progress in this country, say what you please to the contrary.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] said that we discussed the bill for only 19 hours.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been better if we had discussed it for only 19 minutes, and the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol had discussed it for only 19 hours; but we know the rules over there and we know that all procedure is by unanimous consent, and that they do not provide rules as we have in the House here for expediting business. We know how to transact business. The fact is that over here we decide without debating, and they debate without deciding. [Laughter.] Then my genial colleague from Arkansas refers to the big-hearted minority leader, Mr. GARNER. He spoke of his big heart and his great spirit of kindness and his very earnest solicitude in our behalf on the Republican side! Do you not know how earnest he is always in our behalf? "I will give you, my dear brother, a chance to vote on lumber, and I will give you, my dear lady, a chance to vote on sugar." [Laughter.] He is always very much concerned about us, and weeps crocodile tears because our leaders treat us so unfairly. Big-hearted Texas Jack! [Laughter.]

Personally, the gentleman from Texas is a tremendously kind-hearted soul, but when it comes to politics and the maintenance of the position that he is so ably holding as minority leader, he has not a kindly thought toward anybody on our side of the House; in fact, he rejoices at whatever causes us discomfiture, and I have no doubt he prays that political disaster will overtake us. That disposes of that without further discussion.

Then my friend from Arkansas departs immediately from his leader and says that he pleads not through a coalition but for the minority alone to take this strong attitude against this policy. He does not want to invite any help from our side, for which you gentlemen have been fishing with bait of all kinds for the last three or four months. [Applause and laughter.] I still hope to hang the sign on your door, my dear Mr. GARNER, "For sale, one coalition, slightly damaged. No reasonable offer refused." [Laughter.] For the benefit of industry and agriculture, the thing we ought to do regarding the tariff bill now is to have a rule brought in and disagree to all of the Senate amendments and send the bill to conference. That is what we ought to do. [Applause on the Republican side.] If we have not the votes and the House is Democratic, the people of the United States ought to know it, and the sooner the better.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. The gentleman from Arkansas in his peroration—and I imagine he is a splendid lawyer, and I bet that he makes juries cry—pictured the men of the Nation who have risen to places of high estate, and, of course, for the sole purpose of a little sop to the agricultural group, stated that they all came from the farm. It is quite likely that a great many of our great men came also from the cities and towns; but, of course, my colleague was making a plea for the farmers and was not interested in the city boy or his problems. In the days to come when they are discussing a man's fitness for office he will not have to say that he was a log cutter or a driver of mules on a canal. He will simply say, "My dear friends, I am of humble origin; I come from a 1-car family." [Laughter.] That will be sufficient to indicate his humble origin in the days to come.

The gentleman from Arkansas finds some fault with the flexible clause. The constitutionality of the flexible clause was passed on by the Supreme Court, and a lawyer of the standing of my colleague from Arkansas, I am sure, has a great degree of respect for the decisions of the Supreme Court, although lawyers seem to have varying opinions about them. A lawyer

quoted one decision to me the other day and in answer to him I quoted another. He quoted his to me in confirmation of his statement, and when I quoted mine, he said, "Oh, well, the Supreme Court is not infallible." It makes a difference, you see, as regards the point of view. The flexible clause is perhaps the most necessary clause in the tariff bill. I believe it will rebound to the credit of the party that initiated it, and that it will do much to stabilize industry during the periods when we can have no general revision. I think it is safe to leave the change of rates as it is now, in the hands of the President, with the limitation that is in the clause that the information shall be from the Tariff Commission after a thorough investigation and that his conclusions shall be based on that information.

That principle has been held to be sound by the Supreme Court of the United States. I was sorry to see a word changed in it in the Hawley bill. I would like to have seen it left just as it was, because I had sense enough to know, although I was not a lawyer, that if you changed a sentence in it it was liable to go to the court again, and that would mean doubt and delay.

Nearly everything in the world has been said on this tariff question, but the trouble is we have had chiefly a rehash and a rehearsal of statements concerning extortionate rates. My friend from Arkansas [Mr. Ragon] said he did not read a newspaper that was favorable to the Hawley bill when it passed the House. Of course not. Being in favor of anything and praising it to the skies is not now considered a good newspaper method. Finding fault with everything is news, you know. In days past, of Horace Greeley, of the New York Tribune, and Charles A. Dana, of the New York Sun, you could not buy editorial policy in great newspapers for all the money in the world. Nowadays the great department stores and the importers are the controlling influence, through advertising columns, of the newspapers in this country, and that is the reason why they express no sympathy with or recognition of the principle of a protective tariff in many of the newspapers of the United States. [Applause.]

We might just as well tell the truth about this matter. There is no use in trying to get away from it. In past years we had a good many stanch Republican newspapers that stood firmly by the policy of protection, but many of them have fallen from grace. We are now suffering from unemployment in various parts of the country. It does seem as though, whoever writes the tariff bill or whoever is in power, somehow or other in cycles we have periods of unemployment. I do not know whether we shall be able to cure it or not. I am sure of this, however, that the way not to cure it is to allow the admission into this country of the products of cheap pauper labor from other countries. That is the way not to do it. You may find all the fault you can with the policy of protection, but it is the principle and policy that has made this country what it is. The prosperity of the country depends on it—North, South, East, and West—and I am not merely an eastern protectionist, but a protectionist as to all points of the compass. And I know that if the principle does not work—if it is not just as good on hides, leather, and shoes as it is on cream, butter, and cheese, and wool yarns, and your suit of clothes; if it can not be applied in all those cases, then there is something unsound about the policy. But during its history and existence as a policy, a Republican policy, we have had continuous industrial development and success. After all, what is it that makes this country prosperous? The pay roll. What is the necessary thing to have? A regularly distributed, well-filled pay envelope every Saturday night. Strengthen the purchasing power of the men and women who toil in the shops and on the farms. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

THE NATIONAL STOLEN PROPERTY LAW

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in order to present the views of the Attorney General of the United States on the national stolen property law, which passed the House here on February 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on February 5 last, a Calendar Wednesday, the House Judiciary Committee called up the bill H. R. 119, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA]; and according to the bill, to be known as the "national stolen property law."

A few of us opposed that bill before a session of this House with very few Members present. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill I moved to recommit the bill to the House Judiciary Committee. That motion was beaten by a vote of 145 yeas to 202 nays. Most of the nays and some of

the yeas were cast by Members who were not present to hear the debate. At that time those of us who opposed this bill insisted that the Department of Justice should have been consulted before enacting legislation along that line. The truth of the matter is that the Committee on the Judiciary had not referred this bill to the Department of Justice for consideration and comment. At that time I knew, and I so stated on the floor of the House, that the Senate Judiciary Committee had referred the bill to the Department of Justice, and I think I also told you that I had requested the Department of Justice for a copy of its views when such views were sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

On last Saturday the Department of Justice sent me a copy of the letter which that department addressed to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. NORRIS, of Nebraska. I will read the letter, and during the reading of the letter I ask not to be interrupted. If Members wish to ask questions, I shall be glad to yield after I am through reading the letter.

The letter is clear and explicit. Those who were present and heard the arguments against the bill will recognize that the points most emphasized against the bill during the debate in the House are the points that the Attorney General relies upon to oppose the bill as it passed the House on February 5 last and which is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I read:

MARCH 25, 1930.

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS,

Chairman Committee on the Judiciary,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I refer further to your letter of January 25 last, with which you transmitted for my consideration and comment a bill (S. 1099) to prohibit the transportation of stolen property in interstate commerce. A similar bill, H. R. 119, has passed the House and is now before your committee.

There are two serious objections to this measure: In the first place, I am opposed on principle to extending the activities of the Federal Government into fields heretofore occupied by the States, unless there are very cogent reasons for so doing, and I am not satisfied that there is any urgent reason at the present time why the Federal Government should take on this additional function and increase its activities accordingly. In the next place, even though this measure may ultimately be found to be justified, this is not a proper time for its enactment. The machinery now provided by the Federal Government for the prosecution and punishment of crime is overtaxed.

Earnest efforts are being made to devise methods for the relief of those Federal courts which are congested and to increase the capacity of our prisons to satisfy present requirements. Until we have dealt adequately with the troubles which now confront us we ought not to be adding to the burden of the law-enforcement machinery by enacting legislation of this kind. Experience has shown that when Congress enacts criminal legislation of this type the tendency is for the State authorities to cease their efforts toward punishing the offenders and to leave it to the Federal authorities and the Federal courts. That has been the experience under the Dyer Act. State authorities are usually willing enough to allow the trouble and the burden of the expense of prosecutions, including provision of penal institutions, to be borne by the Federal Government.

One may only speculate as to the number of cases which would be dealt with under this proposed statute. During the six months ending December 31, 1929, 14.1 per cent of all persons committed to prison for violation of Federal statutes were violators of the Dyer Motor Vehicle Theft Act. Of 9,420 prisoners confined in Federal institutions at the close of the fiscal year 1929, 1,377, or 14.6 per cent, had been convicted under the Dyer Act. If any serious attempt were made to obtain convictions under the measure now under consideration, there is every reason to believe that the number of prosecutions would exceed those under the Dyer Act. It would be necessary to largely increase the force of the Bureau of Investigation, to increase the forces in the United States attorneys' offices, to provide additional Federal judges or tribunals with the necessary court attachés, and to provide all these officers with offices and working quarters, and, finally, to substantially increase the capacity of Federal prison institutions.

I am satisfied that this is a most inopportune time to consider legislation of this kind, and I recommend against the passage of the bill.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM D. MITCHELL, Attorney General.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 5, 1930, you will find the proceedings and the debate on this bill, beginning on page 3108. In the second column on this page the bill is printed. On pages following are the discussions on the bill, and on page 3117 is the vote of the House on the motion to recommit the bill.

On Wednesday, March 5, 1930, the House had under consideration a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency to

make the slander of national banks a Federal offense. That bill also was thoroughly argued before this House, and when the House got through with it there was nothing left of that bill.

In my opinion, there is no more justification for the enactment of the LaGuardia bill—that is, the so-called national stolen property law—than there is for the enactment of the Brand bill, which was reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and sought to make slander of national banks a Federal offense. Of course, with the Attorney General opposing this LaGuardia bill now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I think the LaGuardia bill is dead also.

I have an extra copy of the Attorney General's letter, which I will present to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia], with the hope that at the first regular meeting of the House Judiciary Committee he will call to the attention of that committee the views of the Attorney General on his bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Ramseyer. I yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the argument presented by the Attorney General, and the argument presented by the gentleman are very able arguments and very persuasive, but I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his opinion that this letter comes within the purview of the prerogative of the Attorney General, telling the House when it should pass legislation and making arguments about policy of legislation.

Mr. Ramseyer. I will answer the question asked by the gentleman. The chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary referred this bill to the Attorney General for his consideration and comment, and this letter from the Attorney General is in answer to that reference, and under such circumstances there is absolutely no question whatever that the department is acting in line of duty, and properly so, in advising the Congress on the propriety and necessity of such legislation.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is my understanding that the province of the department is to advise as to the constitutionality of laws and not to tell us what Congress should do.

Mr. Ramseyer. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. It is the practice of nearly every committee of the House to seek the advice of the different departments. That was the practice of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads when I was a member of that committee. If there were bills affecting post offices and post roads the Post Office Department was always consulted and the bills referred to the Post Office Department for comment and advice. In the same way with bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means. Such bills are always referred to the Treasury Department for consideration and comment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes on the subject that the gentleman from Iowa has just been discussing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss whether or not the Department of Justice acted within its scope in writing on the bill in question, but there is one thing that is evident from the letter which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Ramseyer] has just read, and that is that the Department of Justice misunderstands the purpose of the bill and is not informed on the conditions which made necessary the introduction of the bill.

It is a matter of absolute indifference to me personally whether the bill passes the Senate or not. It came to me after a great deal of study from the United States district attorney in New York City, the National Credit Men's Association, and the National Crime Committee. If the Attorney General of the United States wishes to go on record that he has not time to protect legitimate business in this country and that he has not time to prosecute thieves and receivers of stolen property engaged in interstate crime, that is his responsibility and not mine.

Now, gentlemen, this bill is not at all comparable with the automobile bill. This bill is necessary because crime has kept abreast of advance methods of transportation, while legislation to cope with it has lagged. In fraudulent bankruptcy cases, too, the practice has developed in purchasing large quantities of goods just before going into bankruptcy and shipping them to another State to be resold there. This bill is not intended to reach the porch climbers and pickpockets and petty thieves. The State can and does properly handle such cases. Thieves who operate on a wholesale scale, using large trucks and vans,

empty a loft or warehouse of valuable goods—furs, silks, or other valuable merchandise—and move the entire shipment to a distant point, to some small town where the county authorities will not prosecute because their people have not suffered any damage, and the cost of getting witnesses from distant points is too great for the county to meet. These big criminals are quick to sense the situation and the business of transporting and disposing of stolen goods from one State to another has developed into quite an industry. Surely the Attorney General of the United States is establishing a new policy when he says, "Go ahead, crime; we have not time to prosecute." That is all there is to this law.

Permit me to state that this bill was sponsored by the insurance companies who are now paying millions of dollars in losses; by the Merchants' Association of New York; by the Hon. Newton D. Baker, a member of the President's crime commission, then speaking for the National Crime Committee; by the Bar Association; by the National Retail Dry Goods Association; by the Credit Men's Association of the United States; by the American Bankers' Association; by the Silk Association of America; and by the Jewelers' Security Alliance of the United States. Every large business association and trade association in this country is on record approving this bill. It is the result of a national survey and a thorough investigation conducted for months. It is the result of thorough study and deliberation.

The Department of Justice had notice at the time. The Department of Justice knew the hearings were being held before our committee but the Department of Justice took no action at the time. The only suggestion ever made in connection with the bill did not come from the Department of Justice, but a hint to me in a private conversation that the Department of Justice would be requested to disapprove the bill, because the Federal courts had too much to do. Organized crime has never received such encouragement in the history of the country.

Mr. O'Connor of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. Yes.

Mr. O'Connor of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that letter may have been written in the light of the Literary Digest poll, which would indicate that the Department of Justice is going to have all it can handle without any additional laws?

Mr. LaGuardia. If the Department of Justice is confronted with that proposition let them deal with it and let them deal with it separately. However, we now have this interstate crime, this systematized, organized interstate traffic in stolen goods, which the legitimate merchants of this country, according to the testimony given before our committee, say amounts to over \$100,000,000 losses a year to them. Yet the Department of Justice comes along and says, "Do not pass the bill, because we are too busy." Well, if that is the kind of cooperation we are to expect from the Attorney General we might as well know it. If the Attorney General wants to look into any law then let him look into the antitrust law and let him get busy on a lot of business now pending in his department; let him attend to his business and we will attend to ours. [Applause.]

REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Christopher. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing therein a speech made over the radio by Mr. Guilford S. Jameson, clerk of the House Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a radio address delivered by the clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The speech was as follows:

The people of the District of Columbia are entitled on the fundamental principles of American Government to voting representation in the Congress of the United States and in the Electoral College. To-day Congress is without the power to grant these loyal Americans the privileges of free citizenship. A resolution has therefore been presented to Congress, with the almost unanimous support of the organized citizenry of the District, to amend the Constitution and grant Congress these powers. It provides no change whatsoever in our local form of government, nor does it in any way abridge the complete sovereignty which Congress now possesses over the District of Columbia. Hearings have been held before the House Judiciary Committee, wherein the leading civic, trade, labor, veterans, and other organizations, both local and national, have earnestly urged that this cloud upon our national honor be removed.

To deny the justice of these claims for the rights of a free man every American doctrine, every principle of free government for which our forefathers so freely shed their blood, must be subverted and treated with cold indifference.

DOUBLE CLAIM ASSERTED

The people of this District have a double claim to these privileges. Whereas the powers of the Federal Government over the citizens of the States are limited by the Constitution, the Congress not only governs the residents of the District of Columbia in their capacity as Federal citizens, but being the legislature, with unlimited power over the District of Columbia, it speaks with finality in all local affairs. Therefore the adoption of this amendment will cure a double wrong and grant to our citizens representation in that body which makes their laws, both local and national, which taxes them and sends their sons to war.

No American argument has or ever can be made against granting these rights to the residents of the District of Columbia. On these cardinal principles of free government we lay the foundation of our claims. I repeat them here because by some peculiar mental twist there has been manifested in the most unusual places the thought that if the residents of the District of Columbia ever read them, they should forget them. At any rate, it has been thought by a few that, for no reason whatever, they should not apply to the people of the Nation's Capital.

In the bill of rights the colonists declared:

"That the foundation of English liberty and of all civil government is a right in the people to participate in their legislative councils."

The Declaration of Independence, that document which is read and studied by every school child in Washington, declares:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Again, from that same document, charging the King, they say:

"He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only."

REPRESENTATION PRIDE OF AMERICA

I need not quote further. Every American knows that this Government is founded on the doctrine of the "sovereignty of the people." These principles, the pride of America, which sanctify the ballot because of the precious blood and treasure by which they were secured, are but Utopian declarations so far as the lives of the residents of the District of Columbia are concerned. Is it not a shameful injustice, worthy of the interest and concern of any man, that more than 150 years later we find that over a half million loyal and patriotic Americans are relegated to the status of political serfs—are citizens in name, but subjects in fact, of the American Government? This, too, when every other civilized nation grants the full privileges of citizenship to the residents of its capital city?

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

What can be gleaned from the records to show the intention of the forefathers with reference to this situation? An examination plainly demonstrates that no intention was ever manifested by the founders to leave such a great body of American citizens unrepresented in their Government's councils. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution provided that Congress might acquire a district "not exceeding 10 miles square" by cession of particular States, over which it was to have complete legislative jurisdiction. This was to prevent a conflicting sovereignty at the seat of government. Under that power it might have been a district of 1 mile square, and this problem would never have been born. Further, Senators were chosen as ambassadors of the States. Under such an arrangement no machinery could have been provided for representation. To-day, Senators are directly elected by the people, and the people of this District are as competent to elect one as the citizens of any State in this Union. Why, it was not until 1870 that we had a population equal to that of a congressional district, and as there has never been such a thing as fractional representation, no efforts were made to provide for it. To-day the population exceeds half a million and less than one-eighth of the population is attached to the Federal Government. Nothing more truly demonstrates that our plight was never contemplated by the founders than their omission of any provision to entitle the residents of the District of Columbia to sue in the Federal courts as other American citizens. In *Hepburn v. Elizay*, Chief Justice Marshall said:

"It is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of other States in the Union, should be closed upon them (District residents). But this is a subject for legislative, not for judicial consideration."

ALIENS BETTER TREATED

Has anyone the temerity to maintain that the founders intended to discriminate in favor of aliens as against our own citizens residing in the Nation's Capital? No. They were primarily interested in securing a seat for the National Government. They knew that future statesmen could solve the problems of government that might later arise. The proposed constitutional amendment will also remove this discrimination.

This whole matter is disposed of by Representative SUMNERS, of the House Judiciary Committee, when he says:

"Regardless of what was in the minds of the founders, all they could do was to meet the problems of their time upon the responsibilities of their judgment, and that is the responsibility which confronts this committee now."

Approached from this viewpoint, we find that a body of loyal American citizens, greater in population than the States of Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, Arizona, Vermont, New Mexico, and Idaho, and who pay more Federal taxes than any one of 25 States, are denied the political rights of free men. Yet the colonists severed their relations with the mother country to uphold the principle that "taxation without representation is tyranny." The Supreme Court of the United States has held "that the power to tax is the power to destroy." What true American could yield such tremendous power to any sovereign, be it king or oligarchy, or who, finding himself unjustly in a status of subjection to it, would not resent with all the vigor of his manhood such impotence in government?

WAR RECORD

We point with pride to the record of our people in war. In the Civil War, the Spanish War, and the World War our sons took the field in the Nation's defense—in every instance exceeding our quota. In the World War we sent nearly 18,000 men to serve with the colors and our percentage of volunteers to total enlistments was greater than that of any State in the Union, excepting Rhode Island, Oregon, Washington, California, and Maine, and one-third greater than the percentage of the country as a whole. Why do the people of Columbia want national representation? Because our sons have bled for our country on the field of battle and will again freely give their lives and their fortunes whenever danger threatens. We yield to none in our patriotism and love of our national institutions and we feel that we are entitled on principles of simple justice to participate in the councils of the Government for which so many of our sons have made the supreme sacrifice on the altar of patriotism—to preserve, mark you, the institutions of freedom enjoyed by every other citizen of this Nation, but which are denied to us. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for another."

COLORED OBJECTION FALSE

What are the objections to granting this power? It is said that our percentage of colored population (about 25 per cent) would enable them to control the elections. Nothing could be further from the truth. The answer is that the proposed amendment gives Congress the power to determine the qualifications of electors; that we have a smaller percentage of negro voters than many cities and congressional districts in this Nation. I have heard of no movement to revoke the right of national suffrage and take it from the people residing in the cities of Topeka, Kans.; Atlantic City, Baltimore, and other cities which have a percentage of colored voters approaching, if not equal, to that which we have here. Further, the figures show that the percentage of negro population is on the decrease in the District of Columbia. In 1860 we had 19 per cent, then came the Civil War, and in 1870 we had 33 per cent; in 1880, 33.6 per cent; in 1890, 32 per cent; in 1900, 31 per cent; in 1910, 28 per cent; and in 1920, 25 per cent. The tendency is downward. We are fast growing to a city of a million people. We are not an industrial city, and it is reasonable to assume that the percentage will continue to decrease. Our alien population is negligible, and let me say that the percentage of illiteracy among our colored population is less than one-half that for the colored population of the Nation.

Again, it has been said that the people of the District came here with knowledge of the fact that they would suffer the loss of their political freedom. Such an un-American argument is hardly worthy of a reply. Surely it can not be submitted against the 170,000 native-born residents of this District. But I do not have to answer such a superficial argument. Edmund Burke, in his speech on Conciliation, answered that sort of contention 165 years ago. Here is what he told the British Parliament in reply to those who said the colonists had voluntarily left England and were therefore not entitled to the privileges of Englishmen:

"If I were sure the colonists had at their leaving signed a compact of servitude, yet I should hold myself to conform to the temper of the day and govern 2,000,000 men on the principles of freedom. I would," says Burke, "admit the people into an interest in our Constitution."

Further, it has been observed that if the people wish to vote they should leave here and take up their residences elsewhere. The inhumanity of this argument is readily apparent. To ask a man to leave the place of his birth, his home, and his friends and take up life anew in a strange community, to secure rights that are the birthright of every other American, is the height of absurdity.

My fellow countrymen, if you intend to continue this denial of free-men's rights in the District of Columbia, I beg of you in the interest of human kindness to take away from the 70,000 school children of Washington the glorious histories of America, England, and France. Expunge from their pages the records of woe and misery, of the blood that man has shed against tremendous odds in his struggle for freedom. Men can not be fed on this diet and remain content in political bondage. I

hang my head in shame when I am privileged to address these young hopefuls, America's pride, on some patriotic day, to extol our great American institutions or the life of the great Lincoln, who traveled from log cabin to the highest office in the gift of a free people, only to say to my listeners that these inspiring institutions, maxims, and rewards of American life are none of theirs to have and to hold.

ONLY BIRTHRIGHT ASKED

With pride we point to our record as citizens in war and peace. We have never failed the Nation. They can not fail us now. Let us remove this un-American discrimination and grant to the people of Columbia the birthright of every other American.

As Emerson prayed in his Ode, July 4, so say we all:

"United States! the ages plead—
Present and Past in undersong—
Go put your creed into your deed,
Nor speak with double tongue.

"For sea and land don't understand,
Nor skies without a frown
See rights for which the one hand fights
By the other cloven down.

"For He that worketh high and wise,
Nor pauses in His plan,
Will take the sun out of the skies
Ere freedom out of man."

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS M. BELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing in the RECORD an address made by my colleague, Mr. BELL, of Georgia, over the radio from Toccoa, Ga.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered over the radio by his colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The speech was as follows:

I appreciate very much the invitation by Doctor Forrest, the dean of this wonderful institution, to be with you on this occasion, and I thank him for his words of praise. It is delightful to me to be in your midst because I regard this educational institution as one among the best in this Southland of ours, and I predict a wonderful growth and a further success in this great work, and to the extent of attracting the attention of all good people throughout the width and breadth of our sunny clime. This picturesque spot, nestled as it is at the foothills of the Appalachian Range and in close proximity to Toccoa Falls—the most beautiful in the United States, so far as my observation goes—will ultimately be one of the most delightful places to be found anywhere. I always feel at home in Toccoa.

This is the first time I have ever been "on the air," and I trust it may not result as disastrously as it did to an individual in a Virginia town not many years ago. At Warrenton, Va., as the story goes, a man living in that beautiful town purchased an airship at considerable expense. He employed an expert aviator to teach him how to drive the plane successfully. The two items of expense drew heavily on his financial resources, so he concluded to commercialize his machine to reimburse himself if possible. He arranged his landing field and advertised that he would carry any individual up in the air for 15 minutes for \$15, or two people for \$30. His enterprise proved a financial success; almost everyone in the town had patronized him except a prosperous Jew, who thought the charges were exorbitant. He pestered the aviator so much trying to get him to carry himself and his wife Rachel up for \$15, the price of one, until the owner of the plane finally said to the Jew: "You are the most pestiferous talker I have ever known in all my days, so I have concluded to carry you and your wife both up in the air for 15 minutes for nothing, provided you will not speak a word nor utter a sound on the entire trip." The Jew assented and sent for Rachel and the flight was made. After landing successfully the aviator walked up to the Jew and said, "Well, you win; I can not charge you anything because you did not say a word on the trip." The Jew replied, "No; but I did like to have said something; one time I like to spoke out." The aviator said, "At what time during the flight did you like to have spoke?" He said, "Vell, when Rachel fell out."

This is a wonderful age in which we live. It does look as though we have come to the point where progress has no further field; but who knows? No one thought just a few years ago that millions of people would be driving 50 to 100 miles per hour in automobiles. Twenty-six years ago no one would have believed that within a few years people would be flying through the air at a terrific speed. I saw Wilbur Wright make his first flight in Washington City in an airship. He went about 75 yards and I went home. I had enough, and still have enough, to keep me from riding in one of the pesky things.

We of the South have every reason to be proud. We have more natural resources than any section of this great country of ours. It is quite noticeable at the present time that enterprises in the New England States are as rapidly as possible being abandoned and brought to the South. They must come to the cotton fields. We have the greatest climate and the greatest people in the world. Listen, people, those who are here and those listening in, my prediction to-day is: That the South in 25 years from 1929 will be the richest country in all the world. I will not live to see it, but the most of you will and I am glad for you. I am glad I have lived in the age I have and would not change it if I could. I have lived to see this country rise from devastation and ruin to a height of wonderful prosperity and happiness. The good roads we have and will have in the near future have had more to do and will have more to do with our advancement in every way than anything save the building of good schoolhouses and churches and the full and free acceptance of a living God. I feel when I drive over the good roads in my country a measure of personal pride, because I was the first Member of the United States Congress to introduce a bill to appropriate money for Federal cooperation in building a system of good roads throughout the country. I do not mention this in self-adulation, but because I am proud of the result.

We have one industry in Georgia which is fast becoming the greatest in the world, and that is marble. We have enough marble buried beneath our soil to supply the demands of the world for centuries to come. Another thing which adds greatly to this great enterprise—we have at the head of this most wonderful resource the greatest benefactor to human kind I have known in all my experience and observation, Sam Tate. We have produced great men like Toombs, Hill, Stephens, Long, Grady, Gordon, but none, in my humble judgment, have contributed such a measure of helpful happiness, genuine comfort, and peace of mind to so many people in Georgia as the gentleman whose name I have just mentioned.

My friends, the greatest economic question before the American people to-day and the one which should engage our most thoughtful and serious attention is prohibition. I hope yet to see the demon rum forever banished from our land and country. It is a greater curse to our Nation than all others. I think more and more, every day and every hour, that our efforts will be eventually crowned with success. I hear some say that prohibition is a failure. I deny it. My observation teaches me that there is a larger per cent of sober people to-day than prior to the enactment of our prohibition laws. Well do I remember, as a traveling salesman, while driving into my home city of Gainesville at night that often I would encounter at least 25 drunken men within a few miles of the limits of that city, and to-day you may drive into Gainesville twenty-five times in succession and not meet a single man under the influence of liquor. I remember since my advent into public life that on election days could be found many drunken men at the polls. To-day you seldom, if ever, find the smell of whiskey on the breath of a voter. I grant you that much of this change has been wrought by the presence of the women voters at the polls. While I voted against woman suffrage for reasons I thought good, I have already noted the good effect it has upon our electorate. Pardon me for another personal reference. I am proud that in my political career and in all my political skirmishes I have never used, nor directed the use of, a drop of liquor in my life, and while my future in the political arena may be uncertain, I know of a truth that should my services be prolonged I shall never use a drop of liquor to influence voters, so help me God. Young ladies, those who are here and those listening in, let me say that much depends upon you and your department in stamping out the use of the vile stuff.

If you, one and all, would ostracize from your society every young man who takes a drink of liquor, it would be but a short time before they would cease their drinking or remove to parts unknown. I would to God that all the girls in my native State would determine upon this course and follow this suggestion to the letter. You would be happier and your associates would be happier. Let me suggest to you to memorize and repeat to yourselves that beautiful poem, *The Lips That Touch Liquor Shall Never Touch Mine*.

Young men, those who are listening in, I want you take this one thought home with you: There is no room in the business world for a man who drinks liquor; there is no room in the political world for drinking men; there is no room in the religious world for dram drinkers; there is no room in the social world for a man who indulges in its use. They are relegated to the rear. If you drink—God help you to quit. If it were not for the good women of this country, we would soon go back to the dark ages. But for them we would not be mindful of our decency, for woman, pure woman, is Heaven's last best gift to man. She is the crowning glory of the Creator's handiwork—a fitting close to the labors of a Great and Omnipotent Being. Like a golden clasp, woman binds earth to heaven, time to eternity, and incarnates in realistic perfection the graces—Truth, Honor, Virtue, Love. Standing midway between heaven and earth, woman lifts man insensibly to God. Like the clinging ivy that twines around the stalwart oak and is lifted up by it to spread its gentle leaves and delicate tendrils in the glad, free sunshine of heaven, so woman, frail, dependent, but clinging in

her nature, elevates man to honor and fame and is the fairest, most regal gem in his coronet of renown. When man is thrown from his proud eminence, broken by the reverses of fortune, stricken by the fell hand of disease, woman comes like an angel of light and with tenderest sympathy, most unselfish love upholds his head, solaces his despairing heart, and guides his feeble footsteps once more into paths of safety and peace.

Undismayed by all the grisly, gaunt shapes of disease, she comes and goes, the guardian angel of the living, the compassionate mourner of the dead. Blessed be God for His unspeakable gift of woman, a creature of divine form, instinct with all that is good, pure, chaste, and holy and endowed with heavenly gifts which are so freely shared by her brother man. I know one, of whom I have just spoken, pure and chaste in thought, beautiful in grace and form, courageous in heart, moved by tender pity for mankind, with smiles for the joyous and tears for the sad, going quietly through life, doing a good deed here and a kind act there, walking in truest constancy hand in hand with the promoters of good, in praise of the right, in blame of the wrong; awakened by a sense of duty she bestirs herself in the interest and welfare of those around her and makes life worth living. May Heaven protect her; she is my wife.

There was another, with silver threads among the gold, whose presence afforded sunshine like the beautiful rays from a noonday's sun, whose life and character were as spotless as the snowflakes that fall from the canopy of heaven; bearing the burden and sorrows of others for threescore years and more she faltered not but withstood the conflicts and vicissitudes of life, bearing her own burdens with grace and fortitude, ever loving and forgiving; pressing the fevered brow of the sick and distressed about her, healing a wounded spirit with prayer and supplication, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, supporting the weak, relying on God's everlasting promises, she looked upward, her soul shining brightly like a "symbol of love in heaven and its wavering image here." God keep her; she is my mother.

And now, my friends, I bid you one and all an affectionate good-by. I trust the remaining days of your lives will be only sunshine and gladness, and when that everlasting peace that comes to us all shall have come to you and the solemn mantle of eternal silence rests upon you I pray that a chorus of bright angels will bear you through the gleaming portals and safe within the beautiful gates ajar of heaven and that you may receive a glorious Welcome! Welcome! Welcome!

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement about the program to-morrow. It is now expected we will take up House Joint Resolution 251. This resolution is to promote peace and to equalize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war. It is generally referred to as the universal draft resolution.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman expect to devote the entire day to the consideration of that resolution?

Mr. SNELL. I know of nothing else, and we are going to give as much time as is desired.

Mr. GARNER. Then the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] might get 20 minutes in which to address the House if he should desire to do so?

Mr. SNELL. After the completion of this resolution?

Mr. GARNER. Well, some time during the day.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; I have no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the disposition of the resolution referred to, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. It is requested that to-morrow, after the disposition of the resolution referred to by the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] may proceed for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] may proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia, for five days, on account of the death of his mother; and

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. HARE), for two weeks, on account of illness in family.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on March 28, 1930, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3657. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Custer County, Nebr.;

H. R. 6120. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stats. 630); the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926," dated February 24, 1928 (45 Stats. 137); and the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings," approved January 13, 1928 (45 Stats. 51);

H. R. 11045. An act to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of a site for the new House Office Building; and

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution making an appropriation to complete the restoration of the frigate *Constitution*.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, April 1, 1930, as reported to the majority leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the return of unused premiums collected on policies issued on the lives of seamen during the World War (H. R. 722).

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider proposals for the establishment of veterans' hospitals.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

384. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation of \$25,000 for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, which is supplemental to the estimate contained in the Budget for 1931 (H. Doc. No. 329); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

385. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation affecting existing appropriations until June 30, 1931 (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

386. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to provide for reimbursement of appropriations for expenditures made for the upkeep and maintenance of property of the United States under the control of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

387. A letter from the secretary of Near East Relief, transmitting report to the Congress of the United States for the year ending December 31, 1929; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 274. A joint resolution making an appropriation for participation by the United States in the International Conference for the Codification of International Law to be held at The Hague in 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 278. A joint resolution making an appropriation for participation by the United States in the International Fur Trade Exhibition and Congress to be held in Leipzig, Germany, in 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 283. A joint resolution making additional appropriations for certain expenses under the Department of Justice for the remainder of the fiscal year 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Con. Res. 27. A concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to attend the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Charleston and the two hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the Province of Carolina, to be held in Charleston, S. C., April 10 to 13, 1930 (Rept. No. 1023). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DARROW: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10166. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10585. A bill to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10653. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce a foreign commerce service of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927; with amendment (Rept. No. 1029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10818. A bill to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm, flood, and/or drought stricken areas of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, and Missouri"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 11143. A bill to create in the Treasury Department a bureau of narcotics, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 11200. A bill to provide for the acquisition, sale, and closer settlement of delinquent lands on irrigation projects by the Government to protect its investment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLTON: Committee on Roads. H. R. 10379. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9674. A bill to amend an act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes, approved June 25, 1910; without amendment (Rept. No. 1035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11199. A bill to amend sections 22 and 39, Title II, of the national prohibition act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1033). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CABLE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10960. A bill to amend the law relative to the citizenship and naturalization of married women, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1036). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9557. A bill to create a body corporate by the name of the "Textile Alliance Foundation"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1038). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOWMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9767. A bill for disposal of combustible refuse from places outside of the city of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 845. A bill for the relief of R. L. Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Frost; with amendment (Rept. No. 1012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Addie Belle Smith, with amendment (Rept. No. 1013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7661. A bill for the relief of Margaret Stepp Bown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9017. A bill for the relief of Arch L. Gregg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 495. A bill for the relief of Katherine Frances Lamb and Elinor Frances Lamb; with amendment (Rept. No. 1016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 556. A bill for the relief of Ernst Lueger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KINZER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5459. A bill for the relief of Topa Topa Ranch Co., Glencoe Ranch Co., Arthur J. Koenigstein, and H. Fukasawa; with amendment (Rept. 1018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 195. A resolution to pay Frances Rebecca Robinson, widow of Prince Robinson, late employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such employee (Rept. No. 1022). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2335. A bill providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5295. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Naudascher; with amendment (Rept. No. 1025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8393. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Mettler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SANDERS of New York: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 11082. A bill granting a franking privilege to Helen H. Taft; without amendment (Rept. No. 1037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11161) granting a pension to Hinman E. Ingerson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 11228) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Rock River south of Moline, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 11229) to authorize the purchase of the Christian Church Hospital at Kansas City, Mo., now occupied as a Veterans' Bureau hospital under lease; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 11230) to authorize an appropriation for flood control in and about the city of Middlesboro, State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11231) to authorize an appropriation for the straightening and broadening of the Cumberland River east and southeast of the city of Barbourville in Knox County, Ky., and the broadening and widening of the Cumberland River in and at the "narrows" of such river below Barbourville in Knox County, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 11232) to authorize an appropriation for the purchase and erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. William Butler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11233) to amend the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11234) for the relief of Indians belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians and the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 11235) to authorize the erection of a suitable marker at the spot near Great Falls, Mont., where Lewis and Clark camped with their expedition on July 4, 1805, and held the first celebration of American independence in the new country of their exploration; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 11236) to create in the War Department a board of awards and decorations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 11237) authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the inner and outer channels of Green Bay Harbor, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11238) to amend section 6 of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act to prohibit the killing of wild birds and wild animals in the District of Columbia," and thereby establish a game and bird sanctuary of the Potomac River in the said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11239) to extend the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 43, sec. 1171), as amended, to coal lands in Alabama; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ESTEP: A bill (H. R. 11240) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11241) to provide for the return of unused premiums collected on policies issued on the lives of seamen during the World War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11242) repealing certain provisions contained in the urgent deficiency act approved December 22, 1911, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 11243) authorizing the appropriation of \$25,000 for the erection of a monument or other form of memorial to mark the battle field where the Battle of Brier Creek was fought in Georgia in the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: Resolution (H. Res. 196) for the consideration of H. R. 10960 entitled "A bill to amend the law relative to the citizenship and naturalization of married women, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Territories of the United States under the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, memorializing Congress in behalf of farm relief requesting a reduction on interest rates of farm mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 11244) for the relief of the heirs of the late George W. Soule; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 11245) granting a pension to Mrs. William Alfred Hubler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 11246) granting a pension to Lucinda Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 11247) granting an increase of pension to Dora Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 11248) granting a pension to Charles A. Cottrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 11249) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11250), granting an increase of pension to Grace A. Detwiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 11251) for the relief of the estate of Dr. James Harris Rogers; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 11252) for the relief of Capt. Henry T. Korner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 11253) granting a pension to Addaline Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11254) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. McTwiggan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 11255) granting an increase of pension to Frances Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 11256) for the relief of Shrader Drug Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 11257) for the relief of William H. Egan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. McCORMICK of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11258) granting a pension to Ida M. Tillotson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 11259) for the relief of Harriet Ferguson and James W. Ferguson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 11260) granting a pension to Wayne Ripatte; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11261) granting an increase of pension to Emma P. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 11262) granting a pension to Martha H. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 11263) for the relief of Walter Northrop; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11264) granting a pension to Ella Gill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 11265) granting a pension to Mark Whitney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 11266) authorizing the President to appoint Ronald E. Smith a first lieutenant, Infantry, in the United States Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11267) granting a pension to Augusta Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11268) for the relief of Mary C. Bolling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11269) granting a pension to Hugh R. Wiley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 11270) for the relief of William Fredericks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11271) for the relief of Nolen N. Reynolds; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 11272) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Starrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6125. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of citizens of Northampton County, Va., urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6126. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of citizens of Washington, D. C., opposing the calling of an international conference by the President of the United States, or the acceptance by him of an invitation to participate in such a conference, for the purpose of revising the present calendar unless a proviso be attached thereto definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of blank days; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6127. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolutions of the Regular Democratic Club of the First Assembly District of Queens County, N. Y., favoring the Kendall 44-hour a week bill for postal employees and urging Congress to pass speedily upon this bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6128. Also, petition of Barnard W. Lamb and certain other residents of Queens County, N. Y., petitioning Congress to pass Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates on pension to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6129. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Memorial of Steve Magdie, chairman, and citizens of Ukrainian descent and members of the St Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Brotherhood, Branch 126, of Binghamton, N. Y., protesting against the Russian Bolshevik rule in the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6130. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Elkhorn, Wis., urging the passage of a bill to increase the pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6131. By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of Millington Grange, No. 755, Tuscola County, Mich., in favor of the export debenture amendment as passed by the Senate in the pending tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6132. By Mr. CULKIN: Memorial of the common council of the city of Oswego, N. Y., praying that Congress enact legislation directing the President to have displayed the flag of our country on all Government buildings on October 11 of each year and inviting the people of the country to observe that day in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6133. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of city council of Woburn, Mass., urging the enactment of House Joint Resolution 63; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6134. By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2627, House bills 6802 and 6303, affecting the regulations governing fees collectible upon applications for and issuance of passports and passport visas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6135. By Mr. DOWELL: Memorial of citizens of Polk County, Iowa, urging increased pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6136. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of Eleanor E. Hatch and approximately 73 others, urging an increase of pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6137. Also, petition of Eugene L. Covas and approximately nine others, urging the passage of the Kendall-La Follette bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6138. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Butler County (Ohio) Medical Association, protesting against the passage of the two narcotic bills, H. R. 9053 and 9054; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6139. By Mr. FULMER: Petition indorsing the Johnson bill, H. R. 10381, by Columbia Unit of Post No. 6, American Legion Auxiliary, Columbia, S. C., Mrs. Kenneth R. Kreps, legislative chairman, which proposes to help disabled veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6140. Also, indorsement of American Legion Auxiliary, Columbia, S. C., Mrs. James A. Cathcart legislative chairman, in behalf of Johnson bill, H. R. 10381, which proposes to bring relief to disabled veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6141. Also, resolution passed by the Darlington Kiwanis Club, T. D. Sligh, secretary, Darlington, S. C., in behalf of House bill 9411, proposing to establish a veterans' hospital in South Carolina; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6142. Also, indorsement of Columbia Lion Club, P. D. Brown, president, Columbia, S. C., in behalf of House bill 9411, proposing to establish a veterans' hospital in South Carolina; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6143. Also, indorsement of Columbia Civilian Club, John W. Crews, president, Columbia, S. C., in behalf of House bill 9411, proposing to establish a veterans' hospital in South Carolina; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6144. Also, indorsement of city of Columbia, L. B. Owen, mayor, Columbia, S. C., in behalf of hospital bill, H. R. 9411, to establish a hospital in South Carolina for veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6145. Also, indorsement of Richland Post, No. 6, A. H. Hayden, Jr., post commander, Columbia, S. C., in behalf of House bill 9411, proposing to establish a veterans' hospital in South Carolina; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6146. Also, petition signed by the citizens of Orangeburg, S. C., and the surrounding county, in behalf of bills, S. 476 and H. R. 2562, proposing to increase the rates of Spanish-American War pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

6147. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of Mr. Christopher Meadows and 67 other citizens of Monroe County, Ind., urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6148. By Mr. HESS: Petition of 11 members of Victory Council, No. 180, Junior Order United American Mechanics,

of Miamitown, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 10343; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6149. By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: Petition of C. D. Crowl and 58 other constituents of Lacon, Ill., asking for immediate legislation for the increase of pensions of the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6150. Also, petition of 75 citizens of Henry, Ill., asking for immediate legislation for increase in pensions of the veterans of the war with Spain and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6151. Also, petition of 52 constituents of Peoria, Ill., asking for immediate legislation for the increase in pensions of the veterans of the war with Spain and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6152. Also, petition of Cyrus W. Barnum and 62 other constituents of Peoria, Ill., for immediate legislation for increase in pensions of veterans who served in the Spanish-American War and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6153. Also, petition signed by 53 constituents of Lacon, Ill., asking for immediate legislation for the increase of the rate of pensions for veterans of the war with Spain and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6154. Also, petition of Charles G. Cisna and 15 constituents of Peoria County, Ill., asking for immediate legislation for the increase of the pensions of veterans of the war with Spain and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6155. Also, petition of James E. Saylor and 64 constituents of Peoria County, Ill., asking for immediate legislation for increase of the pensions of veterans of the war with Spain and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6156. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of Frank H. Huntbrinker and other residents of East Carondelet, Ill., urging enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6157. By Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Petition of Arapahoe Community Club, indorsing House bill 9376; to the Committee on Flood Control.

6158. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mrs. A. W. Jenson, of Coolidge, Tex., on behalf of the missionary branch of the Methodist Protestant Church of Texas, in session at Wortham, Tex., protesting the amendment of the eighteenth amendment, and urging a stricter enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6159. Also, petition of Dr. Henry L. Hilgartner, Jr., and 21 other physicians of Travis County Medical Society, of Austin, Tex., protesting against House bills 9053 and 9054, Porter bills, pertaining to narcotic legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6160. Also, petition of N. S. Hunsdon, supervisor industrial education, State Board for Vocational Education, Austin, Tex., indorsing House bill 10821, providing for enlargement of funds for vocational trade work; to the Committee on Education.

6161. By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: Petition of the citizens of Menifee County, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote Senate bill 476 and House bill 10466, and they urge the passage of the above-named bills; to the Committee on Pensions.

6162. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of George Claussen and other citizens of Clinton County, Iowa, urging the passage of legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6163. Also, petition of David L. Black and other citizens of Clinton County, Iowa, urging the passage of legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6164. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the A. Sherman Lumber Co., New York City, protesting against a duty on any kind of Canadian softwoods, rough or dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6165. Also, petition of the New York Lumber Trade Association, New York City, taking a strong stand against the lumber duty and building materials, and urging defeat of the same when voting on conference report; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6166. Also, petition of Private Albert J. Kern Post, No. 715, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging support of House bill 9146, which provides pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the World War, and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6167. Also, petition of Hon. James W. Gerard, New York City, expressing hope that no change will be made in manganese tariff as reported by Senate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6168. By Mrs. McCORMICK of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, urging favorable consideration of Spanish-American War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

6169. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petition containing the names of 38 citizens of Sale Creek, Hamilton County, Tenn., asking immediate consideration of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, for increased rates in pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the period of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6170. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of 37 citizens of Webb City, Mo., urging the enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6171. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Common Council of the city of Stamford, Conn., favoring passage of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6172. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition executed by citizens of Bethany, Mo., indorsing Spanish War legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

6173. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition signed by Mr. John R. Gilson and 39 other residents of Columbiana County, Ohio, urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for an increase in pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6174. Also, petition signed by Bert McConaughy and 70 other residents of the eighteenth congressional district of Ohio, urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for an increase in pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6175. Also, petition signed by William J. Criss and 64 other residents of Jefferson County, Ohio, urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for an increase in pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6176. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Catholic Daughters of America, 200,000 members, protesting against the passage of the so-called Capper-Robson bill, H. R. 10; to the Committee on Education.

6177. Also, petition of John H. Rudebush and several others, of Jersey City, N. J., advocating the passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6178. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of Local Union No. 728, U. M. W. of A., Mount Olive, Ill., urging the support of Senate bill 306; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6179. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of George W. Hughes and others, of the first congressional district of Indiana, that Congress enact into law legislation providing for increased rate of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6180. Also, petition of Anderson & Preston and others of Petersburg, Ind., that Congress enact into law legislation at this session providing for increased rate of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6181. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of city council of Crookston, Minn., urging enactment of House Joint Resolution 167, setting aside October 11 each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6182. Also, petition of Minnesota Occupational Therapy Association, urging continuation of rehabilitation work among disabled veterans and enactment of House bill 10175; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6183. Also, petition of city of Cloquet, Minn., urging enactment of House Joint Resolution 167, proclaiming October 11 as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6184. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by 24 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 10466, proposing increased pensions for soldiers of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6185. By Mr. TEMPLE: Memorial of city council, Monessen, Pa., in support of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6186. Also, petition of Edwin N. Gunsaulus, George Horton, Frank W. Mathin, Chester W. Martin, and others, concerning retired American Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6187. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition signed by S. D. Simms and others, of Jefferson County, Ky., supporting Spanish-American War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

6188. By Mr. WALKER: Resolutions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilmore, Ky., requesting the enactment of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standard of production; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6189. By Mr. WHITLEY: Petition of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 2562, to provide increased pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6190. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of George F. Rollins, L. C. Brown, and 58 others, for increased pensions to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6191. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of Robert M. Clutch and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., and Delaware County, Pa., urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 10466, providing increased rates of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6192. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Monessen, Westmoreland County, Pa., requesting legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6193. Also, statement of Mrs. S. C. Daugherty, of Jeannette, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, April 1, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the foundation of the true and good, the secret of all grace and strength, bestow upon our country Thy patient teaching to its gradual purging from all lingering corruption, that a purer social order may appear.

Make us, in all places, high and low, a people of a wise and understanding heart, that happiness and peace may reign, that the blessing of the Lord, which maketh rich with more than temporal good, may inspire in us a wide and vivid sympathy, a self-forgetting care, and thought for others. Be with us in the leaden hours, through days that are dull and dreary, that when the shadows lengthen and the purple from the distance dies we may still reflect some glory of the secret presence of our God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3168) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington" by adding thereto two new sections, to be numbered sections 8 and 9.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions and concurrent resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution making an appropriation for participation by the United States in the International Conference for the Codification of International Law to be held at The Hague in 1930;

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution making an appropriation for participation by the United States in the International Fur Trade Exhibition and Congress to be held in Leipzig, Germany, in 1930; and

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to attend the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Charleston and the two hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the Province of Carolina, to be held in Charleston, S. C., April 10 to 13, 1930.